Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
SEP 30 1975
DAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1975

Nos. 75-436 and 75-437

JAMES L. BUCKLEY, *et al.*,

Appellants,

v.

FRANCIS R. VALEO, *et al.*,

Appellees.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT AND THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOINT APPENDIX (VOL. II - Part B)
DISTRICT COURT FINDINGS

BRICE M. CLAGETT
JOHN R. BOLTON
888 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

RALPH K. WINTER, JR.
127 Wall Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

MELVIN L. WULF
JOEL M. GORA
American Civil Liberties Union
22 East 40th Street
New York, New York 10016

Attorneys for Appellants

THE CASILLAS PRESS, INC.–1717 K Street, N. W.–Washington, D. C.–223-1220

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Memorandum and Order	1
Findings of Fact	4
I. Findings of Fact Agreed to by the Parties	4
II. Statistical Findings Agreed to by the Parties	264
A. Conway Findings	264
B. Cole Findings	565
C. Additional Agreed Statement of Facts	586
III. Court Findings of Fact	699
IV. Constitutional Questions	754
Letter of July 16, 1975 From Common Cause to District Court	761

7. The following list contains the total campaign expenditure figures for all minor party and independent candidates in the 1974 general election.

Dashes (--) in the expenditure column indicate that Common Cause was unable to locate reports for the candidate. *Congressional Quarterly* is the source of all data on vote percentage and the following list of political party abbreviations.

Abbreviations for Party Designations

A	– American
AH	– American Heritage
AIP	– American Independent
ALI	– Alaskan Independence
C	– Conservative
COM	– Communist
COU	– Courage
CST	– Constitutional
D	– Democratic
EJ	– Economic Justice
FL	– Free Liberation
F&L	– Freedom & Liberty
GWP	– George Wallace Party
HR	– Human Rights
IA	– Independent American
IG	– Industrial Government
IGWT	– In God We Trust for Purified Leaders
IND	– Independent
IV	– Independent Voters
IVP	– Independent Vermonters Party
L	– Liberal
LIB	– Libertarian
LLJ	– Life, Liberty, Justice
LP	– Labor Party
LRU	– La Raza Unida
LU	– Liberty Union
MIP	– Maine Independent Party
NDPA	– National Democratic Party of Alabama
P	– Prohibition
PCD	– Public Congress of Delaware
PFP	– Peace and Freedom
PP	– Peoples Party
R	– Republican
SL	– Socialist Labor
SW	– Socialist Workers
USLP	– United States Labor Party
W	– Workers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[00064]

1974 SENATE MINOR PARTY AND INDEPENDENT CANDIDATES

	General Election Vote %	Expenditures
ALABAMA		
Alvin Abercrombie (P)	4.2	1,428
CALIFORNIA		
Jack McCoy (AIP)	1.7	2,687
Gayle M. Justice (PFP)	1.6	850
COLORADO		
Fred Hyskell (P)	1.0	--
John M. King (IND)	2.0	42,181
Henry John Olshaw (IA)	.2	--
CONNECTICUT		
A.F. Capozzi,Jr. (GWP)	1.8	325
Norman L. Rochon (A)	.2	--
FLORIDA		
John Grady (A)	15.7	148,495
HAWAII		
James D. Kimmel (PP)	17.1	--

IDAHO		
Jean L. Stoddard (A)	1.8	--
ILLINOIS		
Edward T. Heisler (SW)	.4	0
Ishmael Flory (COM)	.2	13,318
INDIANA		
Don L. Lee (AIP)	2.8	19,194
IOWA		
Lorin E. Oxley (A)	.7	462
KENTUCKY		
William E. Parker (AP)	2.4	0
MISSOURI		
Clifford E. Talmadge (IND)	.7	0
NEVADA		
Jack C. Doyle (IA)	6.4	--
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
Carmen Chimento (A)	.7	2,674
NEW YORK		
Barbara A. Keating (CON)	15.9	192,462
Robert E. Massi (SL)	.1	--
W.F. Dowling (COU)	.1	--
Mildred Edelman (COM)	.1	--
Elijah C. Boyd (LP)	.1	950
Rebecca Finch (SW)	.2	1,690

[00065]

Cong. Dist.		General Election Vote %	Expenditures
CALIFORNIA			
34	John D. Donohue (PFP)	1.9	0
	James Manis (AIP)	2.0	1,321
36	William E. Pasley (AIP)	5.1	1,450
37	John O. Ortman (AIP)	3.9	1,214
38	Lee R. Rayburn (AIP)	3.2	550
	Larry B. Kallenberger (PFP)	1.5	--
39	Pat P. Scalera (AIP)	4.4	1,037

40	Grayson L. Watkins (AIP)	5.7	1,241
41	Robert W. Franson (AIP)	2.5	744
	COLORADO		
1	Elmer B. Sachs (AH)	0.7	735
5	Stan Johnson (IND)	3.8	810
	CONNECTICUT		
1	Charlie A. Burke (GWP)	1.4	100
2	Anthony Discepolo (IND)	1.8	1,878
3	Joelle R. Fishman (COM)	1.3	3,846
	Peter Koltypin (GWP)	2.1	2,749
4	Alan B. Fodeman (GWP)	1.6	765
5	Virginia A. Knauf (GWP)	1.6	0
6	Louis J. Marietta (IND)	0.4	0

[00066]

Cong. Dist.		General Election Vote %	Expenditures
	DELAWARE		
1	Donald Gries (A)	0.8	772
	George C. Brown (P)	0.2	31
	John Trager (PCD)	0.8	3,909
	Melvin Dillard (USLP)	0.1	21
	FLORIDA		
5	Glenn W. Turner (IND)	2.5	22,962
	ILLINOIS		
1	Willie Mae Reid (SW)	0.8	0
15	K. Douglas Lassiter (IND)	2.4	1,256

16	W. John Schade (IND)	15.8	9,471
	INDIANA		
4	Donald E. Harris (AIP)	1.6	697
7	Harold P. Schlechtweg (SW)	0.8	0
	IOWA		
2	James W. Whitford (A)	0.8	151
4	Donna Le Porte (A)	0.6	26
	KANSAS		
1	Lorin P. Miller (P)	1.1	--
	Thelma Morgan (A)	7.5	13,642
2	David Scoggin (P)	1.1	--
3	Ted E. Oakes (A)	2.1	--
4	John S. Stevens (A)	8.7	2,922

	KENTUCKY		
1	Robert W. Yoak (A)	3.1	276
2	Leland Neville (A)	3.3	782
3	William P. Chambers (A)	3.1	117
	Luther J. Wilson (IND)	0.7	73
5	Albert G.J. Cullum (A)	2.5	2,557
6	Fred Kerestesy (A)	3.9	100

[00067]

Cong. Dist.		General Election Vote %	Expenditures
	LOUISIANA		
2	Jules W. Hillery (IND)	3.5	100
7	Jeremy J. Millett (IND)	10.7	1,618
	MASSACHUSETTS		
3	Douglas J. Rowe (IND)	12.0	69,267

4	John Rotenberg (IND)	34.7	76,576
7	James J. Murphy (IND)	20.2	187
8	James Kiggen (USLP)	6.9	292
	Laura Ross (COM)	5.3	3,827
9	L.R. Sherman (USLP)	10.7	42
	MICHIGAN		
1	Jacqueline M. Cotton (USLP)	0.2	30
	Hattie L. McCutcheon (SW)	0.4	--
2	Roy S. Jones (AIP)	0.7	--
	Philip S. Carroll (HR)	1.3	47
	Ronald G. Zeigler (USLP)	0.1	185
	Martha E. Pettit (SW)	0.1	--
3	Marvin P. Lightvoet (AIP)	0.7	50
	Bryce F. Zender (HR)	0.6	--
	Steve Beumer (SW)	0.1	--
4	Leslie E. Craine (SW)	0.1	--
	Harold Snyder (AIP)	1.3	110

5	Dwight W. Johnson (AIP)	3.7	11,255
	R. Frank Girard (SL)	0.2	0
	Ann Riley Owens (SW)	0.1	--
6	Howard Jones (HR)	1.4	1,333
	Michael Ballard (SL)	0.1	0
	Margaret M. Hayes (SW)	0.2	--
	R.A. Weder (USLP)	0.1	0
7	Jimmy L. Sabin (AIP)	1.0	1,208
	John P. Freeman (HR)	0.8	0
	John F. Dicks (USLP)	0.1	0
	Sheila Ostrow (SW)	0.1	--

[00068]

Cong. Dist.		General Election Vote %	Expenditures
	MICHIGAN		
8	Nicolee E. Brorsen (SW)	0.1	--
	Mark Nelson (AIP)	1.7	9,307
9	Craig R. Kessler (AIP)	1.1	2,574
	Connie Allen (SW)	0.2	--

10	Kathryn Ropers (SW)	0.4	--
11	Brian Elam (SW)	0.0	--
	Theodore G. Albert (HR)	0.2	300
12	Richard Orawiec (SW)	0.2	--
13	Judith Hagans (SW)	1.1	--
	Percy R. Wheeler (USLP)	0.4	--
14	Joseph A. Spaniolo (USLP)	0.1	0
	Mark Severs (SW)	0.2	--
	Leonard J. Lukomski (AIP)	1.3	10
15	James R. Eades (USLP)	0.1	--
	Claytee Artz (SW)	0.1	--
	Aldi C. Fuhrmann (AIP)	0.9	--
16	Donald A. Bechler (SW)	0.3	--
	Lewis Steinhardt (USLP)	0.2	--
	Virginia Crawford (AIP)	1.3	563
17	Bruce E. Duke (AIP)	0.8	55
	Harry Jock (USLP)	0.1	0
	Christy Wallace (SW)	0.3	--

18	James G. Lott (AIP)	0.4	0
	Matthew Moriarty (USLP)	0.1	0
	Sandra L. Peck (SW)	0.2	--
	Maurice Geary (HR)	0.4	37
19	James Jaber (USLP)	0.1	15
	Rudolph Zeller (SW)	0.1	--
	MINNESOTA		
5	Edmund A. Jurenas (SW)	1.5	260
8	Robert C. Bester (IV)	1.8	150
	William R. Ojala (EJ)	10.0	3,833
	MISSISSIPPI		
1	Jack Benney (IND)	11.8	1,865
2	H.B. Wells (IND)	6.2	3,824

	General Election Vote %	Expenditures
NORTH CAROLINA		
Henry R. Nesmith (USLP)	.9	0
NORTH DAKOTA		
James R. Jungroth (IND)	2.9	13,187
K.C. Gardner, Jr. (F&L)	.4	--
OHIO		
K.G. Harroff (IND)	2.6	7,978
Richard B. Kay (IND)	2.1	3,944
OKLAHOMA		
Paul Edward Trent (IND)	1.7	310
PENNSYLVANIA		
G.W. Shankey, Jr. (CST)	1.1	4,310
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Harold Hough (IND)	1.9	--

UTAH			
	Bruce Bangerter (A)	5.9	1,488
VERMONT			
	Bernard Sanders (LU)	4.1	--
WASHINGTON			
	Eugene Goosman (AIP)	2.0	--
	Clare Fraenzl (SW)	.8	--
	Patrick Ruckert (USLP)	.4	793
WISCONSIN			
	Roman Blenski (IND)	.04	--
	Gerald L. McFarren (A)	2.0	--

1974 HOUSE MINOR PARTY AND INDEPENDENT CANDIDATES

Cong. Dist.		General Election Vote %	Expenditures
	ALABAMA		
1	Mary B. McCarthy (NDPA)	3.6	--

3	James R. Connell (P)	4.1	--
4	Malcolm S. Carpenter (P)	0.2	--
6	Richard Boone (NDPA)	0.7	--
	Elizabeth S. Dillard (P)	1.7	--
7	Frank P. Walls (C)	6.4	--
	Lewis Black (NDPA)	2.6	--
	ARIZONA		
1	J.M. Sanders (LLJ)	6.6	2,632
	CALIFORNIA		
1	Dorothy D. Paradis (AIP)	14.2	1,447
2	Carole J. Glass (PFP)	4.3	65
5	Raymond Broshears (PFP)	2.7	650
6	Emily L. Siegel (PFP)	4.0	20
	Carl R. Davis (AIP)	2.9	0
8	John Holland (AIP)	3.8	410

11	N.W. Kudrovzeff (AIP)	2.9	1,385
13	Elizabeth C. Barton (PFP)	2.6	612
	Floyd S. Stancliffe (AIP)	2.5	157
14	Roger A. Blain (AIP)	4.9	3,696
16	D.J. Mauro (AIP)	3.0	1,665
24	David E. Davis (AIP)	3.0	145
27	Jerry Rubin (PFP)	3.6	0
31	William C. Taylor (PFP)	2.7	577
32	Virgil V. Badalich (AIP)	9.2	1,648
	Frank H. Walker (PFP)	3.1	0
33	James C. Griffin (AIP)	3.5	2,348

Cong. Dist.		General Election Vote %	Expenditures
	MISSISSIPPI		
	Leonard R. Young (IND)	1.0	--
5	Karl Mertz (IND)	8.9	3,180
	Glenn E. Gilley (IND)	2.7	2,251
	Ernest Creel (IND)	1.0	359
	MISSOURI		
3	Marie S. Nowak (IND)	1.4	2,743
5	Edward Verburg (IND)	1.0	192
	NEVADA		
1	Joel F. Hansen (IA)	7.8	6,019
	NEW JERSEY		
1	Elizabeth L. Dreys (IND)	0.5	1,322
	Bradley S. Kirsch (IND)	0.6	2,426
	Raymond Carotenuto (IND)	0.3	850
	James Perry (IND)	2.3	1,588
	Julius Levin (SL)	0.2	0
	Pedro J. Torres (LP)	0.1	--
2	Andrew Wenger (IND)	1.4	521
3	Joseph A. Rogers (IND)	0.8	1,083
	Thomas W. Palven (IND)	0.5	0
5	John Giammarco (AIP)	2.0	0
	Leonard F. Newton (IND)	1.2	7,614
6	B.S. Dogianero (SL)	0.7	0
	John V. Mahalchik (IND)	0.9	0
	Joseph A. Nowak (IND)	0.4	--
7	Milton Gralla (IND)	5.9	25,000
8	Kenneth Kowalczyk (SL)	1.6	--
9	Robert W. Funsch (IND)	0.3	513
	Herbert H. Shaw (IND)	2.2	104

10	Sandra Hill (IND)	3.8	0
11	Robert Clement (SL)	1.3	0

[00072]

Cong. Dist.		General Election Vote %	Expenditures
	NEW JERSEY		
12	Anthony Carbone (IND)	1.1	0
	C. O'Toole French (IND)	0.8	932
	Robert A. Steiner (IND)	0.7	2,660
14	John A. Alston (IND)	4.0	3,821
15	Paul M. Schiff (COM)	1.5	936
	NEW MEXICO		
1	Martin Malloy (AIP)	1.7	0
2	H.D. Horton (AIP)	1.4	227
	NEW YORK		
1	Seth C. Morgan (C)	6.4	4,114

2	Neil Greene (C)	6.5	275
3	Arthur Hoffer (L)	2.2	2,847
9	Theodore E. Garrison (L)	7.0	1,846
10	Francis L. McHugh (C)	11.2	3,381
	John P. Hagan (L)	6.3	0
11	Christopher Acer (C)	8.3	865
	Tibby Blum (L)	5.2	--
12	Teresa Delgado (W)	0.9	1,348
	Martin Shepherd (C)	4.6	--
	Maxine Williams (SW)	0.4	0
14	Donald H. Elliott (L)	13.3	85,680
	Helen Halyard (W)	0.8	1,348
	A.W. Nojovits (C)	3.1	0
15	Herbert M. Feinsod (L)	3.7	--
17	Jerome Kretchmer (L)	9.6	50,964
	Michael Ajello (C)	7.1	588

18	G.M. Drummond (C)	3.7	642
	C. Sojourner (SW)	0.8	0
19	Charles G. Mills (C)	3.1	176
20	Timothy A. Mitchell (C)	4.9	4,376
	Christina Nelson (LP)	0.4	788
	Claire Moriarity (SW)	0.4	0
21	Mary C. Lynch (C)	3.3	0

[00073]

Cong. Dist.		General Election Vote %	Expenditures
	NEW YORK		
22	John Digiovanni (C)	5.9	0
25	Sanford Cohen (FL)	1.2	19,201
26	Thomas Moore (C)	7.5	1,103
27	Franklin B. Resseguie (C)	4.1	31,904
28	E.A. Breitenbach (C)	2.1	1,583
31	Theodore L. Tolles (L)	2.7	46,099
33	Bessie C. Noble (L)	1.2	162
	F.H. Aspinwall (C)	3.3	461
34	J. Warren McGee (C)	2.8	230
	Virginia Tadio (L)	0.7	0
35	David L. MacAdam (L)	0.7	0
	C.E. Carman (C)	2.9	1,743
37	Ira Liebowitz (LP)	0.5	--
39	Joseph V. Damiano (C)	2.6	1,194
	NORTH CAROLINA		
4	M.H. Smedberg (USLP)	0.7	965
5	L.E. Brubaker (USLP)	0.3	965
6	Harry A. Fripp (USLP)	0.4	965
9	G.M. Hooks (USLP)	1.6	965

Cong Dist.		General Election Vote %	Expenditures
	OHIO		
7	Dorothy Franke (IND)	10.8	2,653
8	Don Gingerich (IND)	20.3	36,039
23	Arthur Cain (IND)	1.3	610
	Hugh J. Gallagher (IND)	2.3	4,841
	Bohdan A. Futey (IND)	1.7	7,618
	Dennis J. Kucinich (IND)	29.4	18,195
	OKLAHOMA		
6	Bennett L. Basore (IND)	2.4	2,600

Cong Dist.		General Election Vote %	Expenditures
	PENNSYLVANIA		
1	Bernard Salera (LP)	0.9	1,390
6	Frank E. Huet (CST)	1.4	--
7	Ralph F. Johns (CST)	1.1	743
8	R.O. McKenney (CST)	2.8	0
16	Arlene R. Wenger (CST)	1.5	0
19	Joseph Paul (CST)	1.0	0
22	John Bove (CST)	4.7	4,131
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
1	Charles Amaker (IND)	0.8	0
	Benjamin Frasier (UCP)	0.6	1,172

2	Paul Proveaux (IND)	0.9	0
5	Bert Sumner (IND)	0.8	0
	TENNESSEE		
3	Sarah Delaney (IND)	2.2	24,120
	TEXAS		
11	Laurel N. Dunn (IND)	1.1	--
18	Kris Vasquez (SW)	1.2	0
21	Ed Gallion (A)	2.2	9,260
22	James T. Smith (A)	1.2	--
24	Earl W. Armstrong (A)	3.5	2,706
	UTAH		
1	L.S. Brown (A)	5.9	1,945

2	Karl J. Bray (LIB) Roben J. Schafer (A)	0.6 3.3	0 1,103
	VERMONT		
1	Michael Parenti (LU)	7.1	--

[00075]

Cong. Dist.		General Election Vote %	Expenditures
	VIRGINIA		
3	A.R. Ogden (IND)	10.4	0
4	Curtis W. Harris (IND)	16.9	23,450
6	Warren D. Saunders (A) Timothy A. McGay (IND)	26.1 1.8	57,819 614
10	Francis J. Speh (IND)	1.2	365
	WASHINGTON		
1	Fred Lovgren (SW) Patricia Dolbeare (USLP)	1.1 0.8	-- 205

2	Paul Roberts (USLP)	1.3	400
3	Evelyn Olafson (USLP)	1.0	245
	WISCONSIN		
3	Keith D. Ellison (A)	1.4	918
4	Herbert O. Jahnke (A)	3.8	184
6	Harvey C. LeRoy (A)	5.1	2,449
9	William D. Quirk (A)	2.1	0

[000076]

8. The following is a list of the 25 most expensive races for the House of Representatives in 1972.

Rank, State (district) and candidate	Vote percentage in general election	Total expenditures
1-Massachusetts (5):		
John Kerry (Democrat)	44.7	$279,746
Paul Cronin (Republican)	53.5	171,414
Roger Durkin (Independent)	1.8	61,952
Total		514,112
2-California (17): 1		
Paul McCloskey (Republican	54.6	321,558
James Stewart (Democrat)	35.9	109,418
James Knapp (Republican)	9.5	75,970
Total		506,946
3-Arizona (4):		

Jack Brown (Democrat)	47.0	318,254
John Conlan (Republican	53.0	154,662
Total		472,916

4-Massachusetts (12):		
William Weeks (Republican)	49.7	269,046
Gerry E. Studds (Democrat)	50.3	195,758
Total		464,804

5-Illinois (10):		
Abner Mikva (Democrat)[1]	48.4	218,543
Samuel Young (Republican)	51.6	206,166
Total		424,709

6-California (6):		
Roger Boas (Democrat)	47.9	266,760
William Mailliard (Republican)[1]	52.1	148,550
Total		415,310

[1] Incumbent.

Rank, State (district) and candidate	Vote percentage in general election	Total expenditures
7-New York (24):		
Ogden Reid (Democrat)[1]	52.5	$209,007
Carla Vergari (Republican)	47.8	190,890
Total		399,897
8-New York (14):		
Allard Lowenstein (Liberal)	28.1	285,475
John J. Rooney (Democrat)[1]	53.9	110,054
Total		395,529
9-Louisiana (3):		
Louis Watkins (Democrat)	46.0	229,767
David Treen (Republican)	54.0	155,629
Total		385,396

Rank, State (district) and candidate	Vote percentage in general election	Total expenditures
10-Massachusetts (4):		
Robert Drinan (Democrat)[1]	48.8	199,703
Martin Linsky (Republican)	45.8	148,285
John Collins (Independent-Conservative)	5.4	22,579
Total		370,567
11-Texas (13):		
Robert Price (Republican)[1]	54.8	206,171
Graham Purcell (Democrat)[1]	45.2	149,453
Total		355,624
12-New York (23):		
Richard Ottinger (Democrat)	49.6	195,784
Peter Peyser (Republican)[1]	50.4	154,567
Total		350,351

[1] Incumbent.

426

[00079]

Rank, State (district) and candidate	Vote percentage in general election	Total expenditures
13-New Mexico (1):		
Manuel Lujan (Republican)[1]	55.7	$212,093
J.E. Gallegos (Democrat)	44.3	126,219
Total		338,312
14-California (8):		
Fortney Stark (Democrat)	52.9	266,684
Lew Warden (Republican)	47.1	44,499
Total		311,183
15-Georgia (5):		
Andrew Young (Democrat)	52.8	159,431
Rodney Cook (Republican)	47.2	149,616

427

Total		309,047
16-Hawaii (1):		
Fred Rohlfing (Republican)	45.3	179,221
Spark Matsunaga (Democrat)[1]	54.7	127,753
Total		306,974
17-Missouri (6):		
Jerry Litton (Democrat)	54.6	188,642
Russell Sloan (Republican)	45.4	100,059
Total		288,701
18-Mississippi (5):		
Ben Stone (Democrat)	44.2	163,976
Trent Lott (Republican)	55.3	119,190
Total		283,166

[1] Incumbent.

Rank, State (district) and candidate	Vote percentage in general election	Total expenditures
19-Kansas (2):		
William Roy (Democrat)[1]	60.6	$148,995
Charles McAtee (Republican)	37.1	115,985
Total		264,980
20-California (38):		
George Brown (Democrat)	55.9	154,743
Howard Snider (Republican)	43.4	108,537
Total		263,280
21-Nevada (1):		
James Bilbray (Democrat)	47.8	179,406
David Towell (Republican)	52.2	83,106
Total		262,512

Rank, State (district) and candidate	Vote percentage in general election	Total expenditures
22-Maryland (4):		
Werner Fornos (Democrat)	40.6	145,973
Marjorie Holt (Republican)	59.4	113,513
Total		259,486
23-Tennessee (6):		
Robin Beard (Republican)	55.3	151,605
William Anderson (Democrat)[1]	43.1	105,022
Total		256,627
24-California (7):		
Ronald Dellums (Democrat)[1]	55.9	100,853
Peter Hannaford (Republican)	38.1	100,286
Frank Cortese (American Independent)	6.0	48,980
Total		250,119

[00081]

Rank, State (district) and candidate	Vote percentage in general election	Total expenditures
25-Massachusetts (9):		
John Moakley	43.2	$157,560
Howard Miller (Republican)	14.2	58,240
Louise Day Hicks (Democrat)[1]	41.1	29,686
Total		245,486

Source: Campaign finance monitoring project, copyright, by Common Cause 1973. Printed in Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, 93rd Cong., 1st Sess. (Oct.-Nov. 1973), 417-419.

[000082]

9. The following is a list of the 10 most expensive races for the Senate in 1972.

	Vote margin (percent)	Contributions: Total contributions	Contributions: Contribution ratio between candidates	Expenditures: Total expenditures	Expenditures: Expenditure ratio between candidates
Texas:					
John Tower[1] --	53.4	$2,303,355	$3.65	$2,301,870	$3.66
Barefoot Sanders ----	44.5	630,440	1.00	629,008	1.00
Michigan:					
Robert Griffin[1]	52.2	1,443,304	2.65	1,394,927	2.54
Frank Kelley -	46.7	544,009	1.00	547,819	1.00
Illinois:					
Charles Percy[1] ------	61.4	1,399,374	4.12	1,408,822	4.20
Roman Pucinski	38.6	339,402	1.00	335,482	1.00

[1] Incumbent.

432

[00083]

	Vote margin (percent)	Contributions: Total contributions	Contributions: Contribution ratio between candidates	Expenditures: Total expenditures	Expenditures: Expenditure ratio between candidates
Alabama:					
John Sparkman[1] ---	63.9	703,342	.90	702,109	.92
Winton Blount	32.5	774,039	1.00	764,961	1.00
Kentucky:					
Walter Huddleston -----	51.0	653,412	1.07	658,590	1.09
Louie Nunn ---	47.6	611,013	1.00	603,649	1.00
Oklahoma:					
Dewey Bartlett	51.5	625,639	1.19	625,095	1.22
Ed Edmondson -	45.9	525,900	1.00	512,058	1.00

433

North Carolina:					
Jesse Helms --	54.1	659,895	1.33	654,246	1.39
N. Galifianakis -------	45.9	496,667	1.00	470,093	1.00
Tennessee:					
Howard Baker[1]	61.8	887,817	3.70	830,769	3.40
Ray Blanton	38.2	239,699	1.00	244,653	1.00
Louisiana:					
Bennett Johnston ----	54.9	556,912	1.09	511,616	1.00
John McKeithen	23.2	394,510	1.00	394,510	1.00
Ben Toledano -	19.0	118,906		116,347	
Georgia:					
Sam Nunn -----	53.6	629,570	1.39	567,968	1.28
Fletcher Thompson ----	46.4	454,586	1.00	444,635	1.00

434

Incumbent,
ource: Campaign finance monitoring project. Printed in Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration, House of epresentatives, 93rd Cong., 1st Sess. (Oct.-Nov. 1973), 422.

[000084]

10. The following chart shows the 25 most expensive House races in 1974.

[00085]

*winner
°candidate of party that last held District
+incumbent

TABLE OF TWENTY-FIVE MOST EXPENSIVE HOUSE RACES IN 1974

435

	State & District	Percentage of Vote Primary	Percentage of Vote General	Total $ Contributions	Total $ Expenditures
Ed Gallion (A)	Texas	x	2.2	9,260	9,261
Douglas S. Harlan (R)	(21)	60.8	45.2	167,441	164,675
*° Robert (Bob)Krueger(D)		31.7	52.6	295,755	358,645
					532,581
* Abner J. Mikva (D)	Illinois	x	51.3	264,650	286,225
+ Samuel H. Young (R)	(10)	x	48.7	256,513	251,249
					537,474

Nicolee E. Brorsen(SW)	Michigan	x	.1	0	0
Mark Nelson (AIP)	(8)	x	1.7	4,417	4,596
James M. Sparling,Jr.(R)		89.9	43.4	84,829	82,856
*+Jerome R. Traxler (D)		x	54.8	79,129	78,856
					161,712
Christopher Acer (C)	New York	x	8.3	865	865
Edward G. Desborough(R)	(11)	x	14.2	808	808
°James H. Scheuer (D)		53.4	72.2	305,254	301,135
					302,809
°Jeffrey LaCaze (D)	Louisiana	P.36.1	50.0	229,710	229,335
*W. Henson Moore III (R)	(6)	RU.51.6	50.0	170,735	158,971
					388,306
*Jack Hightower (D)	Texas	64.2	57.6	127,747	124,132
+Robert Price (R)	(13)	x	42.4	140,526	157,697
					281,829
+Joel T. Broyhill (R)	Virginia	Conven.	45.2	206,729	248,709
*Joseph L. Fisher (D)	(10)	42.2	53.6	144,835	144,751
					393,460
Charles Grisbaum,Jr.(D)	Louisiana	x	41.5	156,341	166,203
*+David C. Treen (R)	(3)	x	58.5	190,241	190,135
					356,338

*James D. Santini (D)	Nevada	53.8	55.8	122,855	144,366
Joel F. Hansen (IA)		x	7.8	6,618	6,019
David Towell (R)		87.1	36.4	102,609	111,697
					262,082

[00086]

TABLE OF TWENTY-FIVE MOST EXPENSIVE HOUSE RACES IN 1974

	State & District	Percentage of Vote Primary	Percentage of Vote General	Total $ Contributions	Total $ Expenditures
Charles J. Horne (D)	Virginia	Conven.	49.1	198,649	232,341
*+William C. Wampler (R)	(9)	Conven.	50.9	128,642	116,944
					349,285
*Willis D. Gradison, Jr. (R)	Ohio (1)	52.1	50.9	126,505	126,407
+Thomas A. Luken (D)		x	49.1	78,978	79,500
					205,907

	Elizabeth C. Barron (PFP)	California (13)	x	2.6	659	659
°	George W. Milias (R)		46.3	42.4	122,848	122,239
*	Norman Y. Mineta (D)		77.8	52.6	188,090	185,236
	Floyd S. Stancliffe (AIP)		x	2.5	167	167
						308,301
	Joseph D. Early (D)	Massachusetts (3)	31.8	49.5	120,756	120,534
	David J. Lionett (R)		83.2	38.4	112,806	120,978
	Douglas J. Rowe (IND)		x	12.0	61,569	69,267
						310,829
	Julian Camacho (D)	California (16)	61.7	47.8	151,622	156,084
	D.J. Mauro (AIP)		x	3.0	285	1,665
*+	Burt L. Talcott (R)		x	49.2	153,572	152,455
						310,204
+	Donald G. Brotzman (R)	Colorado (2)	x	48.1	150,253	165,911
*	Timothy E. Wirth (D)		x	51.9	130,903	134,103
						300,014
*°	Butler C. Derrick, Jr. (D)	South Carolina (3)	65.2	61.8	149,126	176,022
	Marshall J. Parker (R)		x	38.2	105,674	105,987
						282,009

438

*	Robin L. Beard, Jr. (R)	Tennessee (6)	x	56.7	189,788	189,216
	Tim Schaeffer (D)		48.9	43.3	97,243	96,288
						285,504
	Val Oshel (R)	Illinois (24)	57.7	59.6	51,319	50,566
*°	Paul Simon (D)		68.4	40.4	225,123	223,163
						273,729

[00087]

TABLE OF TWENTY-FIVE MOST
EXPENSIVE HOUSE RACES IN 1974

		State & District	Percentage of Vote Primary	Percentage of Vote General	Total $ Contributions	Total $ Expenditures
	Frederick M. Bohen (D)	New Jersey (5)	57.4	43.5	105,297	117,033
*°	Millicent Fenwick (R)		47.9	53.4	132,992	131,861
	John Giammarco (AIP)		x	2.0	0	0
	Leonard F. Newton (IND)		x	1.2	6,229	7,706
						256,600
	Alan B. Fodeman (GWP)	Connecticut (4)	x		837	765
	James G. Kellis (D)		x	46.7	52,147	51,034
*+	Stewart B. McKinney (R)		x	53.3	99,930	99,177
						150,976

439

Mike McKool (D)	Texas	51.4	47.9	122,086	122,086
*+ Alan Steelman (R)	(5)	x	52.1	170,027	168,457
					290,543
Bill Clinton (D)	Arkansas	P.43.6	48.2	178,195	180,882
*+ John P. Hammer-schmidt (R)	(3)	RU.69.0	51.8	97,106	101,709
					282,591
Steve Babcock (D)	Minnesota	51.8	46.9	124,581	142,812
*° Tom Hagedorn (R)	(2)	72.8	53.1	148,284	148,833
					291,645
William L. Hensley (D)	Alaska	50.2	46.2	133,235	136,112
*+ Donald E. Young (R)		x	53.8	148,315	140,729
					276,841
+Robert J. Huber (R)	Michigan	x	40.2	114,463	120,426
James Gordon Lott (AIP)	(18)	x	.4	0	0
Matthew Moriaty (USLP)		x	.1	0	0
Sandra L. Peck (SW)		x		0	0
*James J. Blanchard (D)		33.8	58.7	133,639	133,021
Maurice Geary (HR)		x	.4	91	91
					253,538

[000088]

11. More than $74 million was reported spent by the 1161 candidates for Congress who ran in the 1974 general elections. This included 468 Democratic candidates, 407 Republicans and 286 minor party and independent candidates. These figures cover the period from September 1, 1973, to December 31, 1974. See Attachments A, B, and C to the April 21, 1975 Conway affidavit summarizing expenditures for all candidates who ran in the 1974 general elections. The more than $74 million total reported as spent in 1974 by general election Congressional candidates compares with $66.4 million reported as spent in 1972. The 1972 figure covers the period from April 7, 1972, the effective date of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, through December 31, 1972.

12. Major party candidates who ran in the 1974 general election reported spending $72,733,053 compared with $1,184,204 in expenditures reported by minor party and independent candidates. The expenditures reported by minor party and independent candidates represented approximately 1.7 percent of the total spending reported by Congressional candidates who ran in the 1974 general election.

[000089]

House Spending – 1974

13. Some $45.1 million was reported spent by 1,056 House candidates who ran in the 1974 general elections. This included $23,697,812 by 434 Democratic candidates, $20,608,933 by 376 Republican candidates and $825,478 by 246 minor party and independent candidates.

14. There were 323 House incumbents who ran in the 1974 general election against major party challengers. Total expenditures reported by these incumbents was $20,542,838 compared with $12,894,695 reported by their major party challengers.

15. There were 52 House races in which no incumbent competed in the general election. Total expenditures reported by the 52 Democrats in these races were $5,644,054 compared with $4,185,069 spent by their Republican opponents.

16. There were 60 House races in which the incumbent was unopposed in the general election by a major party challenger. This included 59 Democratic incumbents and 1 Republican incumbent. The total expenditures reported by these 60 incumbents was $1,040,089.

[000090]

17. Paragraphs 18-22, 41-44 assume that House candidates may spend $84,000 ($70,000 plus an additional $14,000 in expenditures relating to fundraising) for the primary election and a similar $84,000 for the general election. The computations that are made in paragraphs 18-22 are based on a comparison of the total amount spent by each candidate for the primary and general election with the total of $168,000 (the $84,000 in the primary and the $84,000 in the general).

18. Of the 810 major party House candidates, 22 or 2.7 percent reported total expenditures higher than $168,000. All of these 22 were major party candidates, including 10 incumbents, 3 challengers to incumbents, and 9 candidates in races not involving an incumbent in the general election (2 of these 9 candidates defeated incumbents in the primaries). Of the 22 who spent higher than $168,000,

7 incumbents won and 3 lost, 1 challenger won and 2 lost, and 8 candidates in open races (not involving an incumbent) won and 1 lost.

19. No minor party or independent House candidate in 1974 had expenditures higher than $168,000. The highest total amount reported spent by the 246 minor

[000091]

party and independent House candidates who ran in the general election was $85,680 by Don Elliott (Lib-NY). Elliott ran as a Liberal in the general election following his defeat in the Democratic primary by the incumbent Congressman. Only 15 of the remaining 245 minor party and independent candidates reported spending more than $10,000.

20. Forty major party challengers defeated House incumbents in the general election. Only one of the 40 challengers spent more than $168,000. Eighteen of the 40 challengers spent less than $84,000; 18 of the 40 challengers who won were outspent by the incumbents they defeated.

21. Major party challengers were outspent by incumbents in 78 percent or 252 of the 323 races involving incumbents and major party challengers. Approximately 83 percent or 268 of the 323 major party challengers to incumbents spent less than $84,000 and approximately 69 percent or 223 spent less than $50,000.

22. There were a number of marginal House races in 1974 (*i.e.*, races decided by 55 percent or less) in which the incumbents substantially outspent their major party challengers.

[000092]

Senate Spending – 1974

23. Some $28.9 million was reported spent in the 34 Senate races by the 105 candidates who ran in the 1974 general election. This included $16,583,683 by 34 Democratic candidates, $11,842,625 by 31 Republicans and $458,726 by 40 minor party and independent candidates.

24. There were 22 Senate incumbents who ran in the 1974 general election against major party challengers. Total expenditures reported by these incumbents was $13,151,492 compared with $7,316,731 reported by their major party challengers.

25. There were 9 Senate races in which no incumbent competed in the general election. Total expenditures reported by the 9 Democrats in these races were $4,794,221 compared with $2,422,497 reported spent by their Republican opponents. (Two of the Democrats defeated incumbents in the primary).

26. There were 3 Senate races in which the incumbent was unopposed in the general election by a major party challenger. The total expenditures reported by these three Democratic incumbents was $741,367.

[000093]

27. Paragraphs 28-34, 48-50 assume that Senate candidates may spend the aggregate of 8 cents per adult for the primary election and 12 cents per adult for the general election plus an additional 20 percent in the primary and in the general election for expenditures relating to fundraising in each, combined for a total of 24 cents per adult.

28. Of the 65 major party candidates, 17 had total expenditures greater than 24 cents per adult. These 17 candidates included 9 incumbents, 4 challengers to incumbents (3 of whom were outspent by their incumbent opponents), and 4 candidates running in a race with no incumbent. Of the 17, 8 incumbents won and 1 lost, 1 challenger to an incumbent won and 3 lost, and 2 candidates in open races (not involving an incumbent) won and 2 lost.

29. No minor party or independent Senate candidate had expenditures higher than 24 cents per adult. The highest total reported spent by the 40 minor party and independent candidates was $192,462 by Barbara A. Keating, the Conservative Party candidate in New York. The only other such candidate to spend over $100,000 was John Grady, the American Party candidate in Florida who

[000094]

reported spending $148,495. Only one other candidate reported spending more than $20,000, John M. King in Colorado, an independent candidate who reported $42,181.

30. Two of the 22 major party challengers to incumbents won their election in 1974. Of these two, one, Governor Wendell Ford (D-Ky.), spent more than 24 cents per adult, while one, Gary Hart (D-Colo.), spent less than this amount. Ford outspent his incumbent opponent while Hart was outspent by his incumbent opponent.

31. Major party challengers were outspent by their incumbent opponents in 21 of the 22 races involving an incumbent and major party challenger.

32. The 1 challenger who outspent an incumbent was Governor Wendell Ford who spent $1,006,670 compared with $524,569 by Senator Marlow Cook. Ford received

53.5 percent of the vote compared with Cook's 44.1 percent of the vote. Twenty-four cents per adult multiplied by the voting age population equals $551,040.

The only other challenger to an incumbent who won was Gary Hart who received 57.2 percent of the vote compared with 39.5 percent for Dominick. Dominick

[000095]

outspent Hart $502,343 to $351,557. Twenty-four cents per adult multiplied by the voting age population equals $412,560.

33. There were 9 Senate races involving incumbents in which the winner received less than 55 percent in the general election. Eight were won by incumbents and 1 by a challenger to an incumbent. The 8 winning incumbents all substantially outspent their major party challengers. Five of the 8 spent more than 24 cents per adult, as opposed to 2 of the challengers. These 8 races included:

	Expenditures	Overall Combined Spending Limit	Vote %
McGovern SD-D*	$1,172,831	$ 300,000	53.0
Thorsness R	528,817		47.0
Javits NY-R*	1,090,437	3,048,000	45.3
Clark D	855,576		38.2
Dole KS-R*	1,110,024	384,240	50.9
Roy D	836,927		49.1
Bayh IN-D*	1,024,486	864,720	50.7
Lugar R	619,678		46.4
Schweiker PA-R*	799,499	2,000,640	53.0
Flaherty D	256,483		45.9
Bellmon OK-R*	622,480	450,960	49.4
Edmondson D	195,429		48.9

Packwood OR-R*	333,004	380,880	54.9
Roberts D	80,193		44.2
Young ND-R*	300,121	300,000	48.4
Guy D	115,561		48.3

* Indicates an Incumbent

[000096]

Congressional Spending – 1972

34. Over $66.4 million was reported spent by the 1,115 candidates for Congress who ran in the 1972 general elections. This included 460 Democratic candidates, 422 Republicans and 233 minor party and independent candidates. These figures cover the period from April 7, 1972 to December 31, 1972.

35. Major party candidates who ran in the 1972 general election reported spending $64,657,811 compared with $1,670,892 in expenditures reported by minor party and independent candidates. The expenditures reported by minor party and independent candidates represented approximately 2.5 percent of the total spending reported by Congressional candidates who ran in the general election.

House Spending – 1972

36. Some $39.9 million was reported spent by 1,009 House candidates who ran in the 1972 general elections. This included $19,773,619 by 427 Democratic candidates, $18,880,327 by 389 Republican candidates and $1,230,364 by 193 minor party and independent candidates.

[000097]

37. There were 321 House incumbents who ran in the 1972 general election against major party challengers. Total

expenditures reported by these incumbents was $16,336,981 compared with $10,244,723 reported by their major party challengers.

38. There were 59 House races in which no incumbent competed in the general election. Total expenditures reported by the 59 Democrats in these races were $5,520,613 compared with $5,017,313 spent by their 57 Republican opponents.

39. There were 52 House races in which the incumbent was unopposed in the general election by a major party challenger. This included 44 Democratic incumbents and 8 Republican incumbents. The total expenditures reported by these 52 incumbents was $903,342.

40. Of the 816 major party House candidates in the general election, 20 or 2.4 percent reported total expenditures higher than $168,000. These 20 major party candidates included 6 incumbents, 5 challengers to incumbents, and 9 candidates in races not involving an incumbent in the general election (1 of these candidates

[000098]

defeated an incumbent in the primary). Of the 20, 5 incumbents won and 1 lost, 1 challenger won and 4 lost, and 3 candidates in open races (not involving an incumbent) won and 6 lost.

41. The highest total amount reported spent by the 193 minor party and independent candidates who ran in the general election was $285,475 by Allard Lowenstein (Lib-NY). Lowenstein ran as a Liberal in the general election, after losing in a Democratic primary and a court-ordered second primary against a Democratic incumbent. Loweinstein was the only minor party or independent House

candidate to spend more than $168,000. Only 18 of the remaining 193 minor party and independent candidates reported spending more than $10,000 and only one reported expenditures greater than $84,000.

42. Ten major party challengers defeated House incumbents in the general election. Only one of the 10 spent more than $168,000. Three of the 10 spent less than $84,000. Two of the 10 challengers were outspent by the incumbents that they defeated.

43. Major party challengers were outspent by incumbents in almost 78 percent or in 249 of the 321 races involving incumbents and major party challengers.

[000099]

Approximately 89 percent or 285 of the 321 major party challengers to incumbents spent less than $84,000 and approximately 77 percent or 247 spent less than $50,000.

Senate Spending – 1972

44. Some $26.4 million was reported spent in the 33 Senate races by the 106 candidates who ran in the 1972 general election. This included $10,568,496 by 33 Democratic candidates, $15,435,369 by 33 Republicans and $440,528 by 40 minor party and independent candidates.

45. There were 25 Senate incumbents who ran in the 1972 general election against major party challengers. Total expenditures reported by these incumbents was $12,385,599 compared with $6,101,581 reported by their major party challengers.

46. There were 8 Senate races in which no incumbent competed in the general election. Total expenditures reported by the 8 Democrats in these races was

$3,849,246 compared with $3,667,870 reported spent by their Republican opponents. (Two of the Democrats defeated incumbents in the primary).

47. Of the 66 major party candidates, 18 had total expenditures higher than 24 cents per adult. These

[000100]

18 candidates included 7 incumbents, 2 challengers to incumbents (1 of whom was outspent by his incumbent opponent), and 9 candidates running in a race with no incumbent. Of the 18, 7 incumbents won, 2 challengers to incumbents lost and 5 candidates in open races (not involving an incumbent) won and 4 lost.

48. No minor party or independent Senate candidate had total expenditures higher than 24 cents per adult. The highest total reported spent by the 40 minor party and independent candidates was $394,510 by John McKeithen, an independent candidate in Louisiana. The only other such candidate to spend over $10,000 was John Quattrach, an independent candidate in Rhode Island who reported spending $11,904.

49. Five of the 24 major party challengers to incumbents won their election in 1972. Of the 5, none spent more than 24 cents per adult. Three outspent their incumbent opponents, while 2 were outspent by the incumbents they defeated.

50. Major party challengers were outspent by their incumbent opponents in 19 of the 25 races involving an incumbent and major party challenger. Of the 6 challengers who outspent incumbents, 3 won and 3 lost.

[000101]

Presidential Spending – 1972

51. President Richard Nixon reported spending a total of 55.2 million in seeking re-election to the Presidency in 1972. Senator George McGovern reported spending a total of approximately $38.2 million in seeking election to the Presidency in 1972. Minor party committees supporting 8 Presidential candidates and 3 independent Presidential candidates reported spending a total of $1,005,000. The latter represents 1 percent of the total spending reported by the two major party candidates for President in 1972. Both of the major party nominees for President reported total expenditures higher than $36,000,000 while none of the minor party or independent candidates spent more than $36,000,000. The figure $36,000,000 is a total of: (1) $10,000,000 permitted under the 1974 Amendments for Presidential primary campaigns; (2) $20,000,000 permitted under that statute for Presidential general election campaigns; (3) 20 percent of both $10,000,000 and $20,000,000 for expenditures related to fundraising.

Congressional Contributions from Individuals – 1974

52. The 1,161 candidates for Congress who ran in the 1974 general elections reported contributions of $73,483,613 for the period September 1, 1973 through

[000102]

December 31, 1974. An additional $3,687,603 was held as cash on hand by these candidates on September 1, 1973 for an overall total of $77,171,216 in funds available for the 1974 elections. The cash on hand funds represent contributions received prior to September 1, 1973 and

for the most part are funds carried over from past elections. Of the $77,171,216 in total funds available reported by these candidates, major party candidates reported contributions of $75,906,609 compared with $1,264,607 in contributions reported by minor party and independent candidates.

53. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, $3,781,254 in individual contributions to these 1,161 candidates (not counting loans) would be eliminated.

54. The $3,781,245 given by individuals over and above a $1,000 limit per candidate represents 5.1 percent of the $73,483,613 in contributions raised during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974. (Cash on hand as of September 1, 1973 is not included in the following analyses, since it is not possible to

[000103]

determine how much of these funds represents contributions over $1,000.)

55. Of the $3,781,254 in contributions over and above a $1,000 limit per candidate, $1,677,672 went to incumbents, compared with $849,367 which went to major party challengers to incumbents. If the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 per candidate were eliminated, about twice as much would be eliminated from the incumbent totals as from the totals for major party challengers to incumbents. ($1,199,147 went to major party candidates in open races not involving an incumbent.)

56. $55,068 of the $3,781,254 in contributions over and above a $1,000 limit went to minor party and independent candidates. This represents 1.5 percent of the total funds raised over and above a $1,000 limit during the period. It also represents 4.4 percent of the $1,264,607 in total contributions reported by independent and minor party candidates.

57. Incumbents who ran in the general election reported contributions during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974 of $35,704,135 compared with $19,860,210 reported by major party challengers to

[000104]

incumbents in the general election, for a total of $55,564,345. The major party challengers therefore reported raising 35.74 percent of the $55,564,345 total and 55.62 percent of the funds raised by incumbents.

58. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, the totals raised by incumbents would be $34,012,713 compared with $19,010,843 raised by major party challengers to incumbents in the general election for a total of $53,023,556. Major party challengers, therefore, would have raised 35.84 percent of the $53,023,556 total and 55.88 percent of the funds raised by incumbents.

59. Major party candidates who ran in the general election reported contributions during the period of September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974 of $72,219,006 compared with $1,264,607 reported by minor party and independent candidates for a total of $73,483,613. Minor party and independent candidates therefore reported raising

1.72 percent of the $73,483,613 total and 1.75 percent of the funds raised by major party candidates.

[000105]

60. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, the totals raised by major party candidates would be $68,492,817 compared with $1,209,539 raised by minor party and independent candidates for a total of $69,702,356. Minor party and independent candidates therefore would have raised 1.73 percent of the $69,702,356 total and 1.77 percent of the funds raised by major party candidates.

61. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the amounts of individual contributions in excess of $2,000 per candidate were eliminated, a total of $2,040,116 in individual contributions to these 1,161 candidates (not counting loans) would be eliminated.

62. The $2,040,116 given by individuals over and above a $2,000 limit per candidate represents 2.7 percent of the $73,483,613 in contributions raised during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974.

63. Of the $2,040,116 in contributions over and above a $2,000 limit per candidate, $860,224 went to

[000106]

incumbents, compared with $461,596 which went to major party challengers to incumbents. If the excess of individual contributions over $2,000 per candidate were eliminated, about twice as much would be eliminated from the incumbent totals as from the totals for major party challengers to incumbents. ($682,220 went to major party candidates in open races not involving an incumbent.)

64. $36,076 of the $20,040,116 in contributions over and above a $2,000 limit went to major party and independent candidates. This represents 1.8 percent of the total funds raised over and above a $2,000 limit during the period. It also represents 2.9 percent of the total $1,264,607 reported in contributions by independent and minor party candidates.

65. Incumbents who ran in the general election reported contributions during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974 of $35,704,135 compared with $19,860,210 reported by major party challengers to incumbents in the general election for a total of $55,564,345. The major party challengers therefore reported raising 35.74 percent of the $55,564,345 total reported by these candidates during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974 and 55.62 percent of

[000107] - [000108]

the funds raised by incumbents.

66. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $2,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, the totals raised by incumbents would be $34,830,161 compared with $19,398,614 raised by major party challengers to incumbents in the general election for a total of $54,228,775. Major party challengers therefore would have raised 35.77 percent of the $54,228,775 total and 55.69 percent of the funds raised by incumbents.

67. Major party candidates who ran in the general election reported contributions during the period of September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974 of $72,219,006 compared with $1,264,607 reported by minor party and independent candidates for a total of $73,483,613. Minor

party and independent candidates therefore reported raising 1.72 percent of the $73,483,613 total and 1.75 percent of the funds raised by major party candidates.

68. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $2,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, the totals raised by major party candidates would be $70,214,966 compared with $1,228,531 raised by minor party and independent candidates for a

[000109]

total of $71,443,497. Minor party and independent candidates therefore would have raised 1.72 percent of the $72,443,497 total and 1.75 percent of the funds raised by major party candidates.

Congressional Contributions – 1972

69. $69,644,378 was reported in total contributions by the 1,115 candidates for Congress who ran in the 1972 general election (including cash on hand as of April 7, 1972).

70. Major party candidates who ran in the 1972 Congressional general election reported total contributions of $68,029,405 for the period April 7, 1972 through December 31, 1972 (including cash on hand as of April 7). This compares with $1,614,973 in contributions reported by minor party and independent candidates. The contributions reported by minor party and independent candidates represent 2.4 percent of the total contributions reported by Congressional candidates who ran in the 1972 general election.

[000110]

Presidential Contributions from Individuals – 1972

71. President Richard Nixon reported raising total contributions of $60.2 million with respect to the 1972 Presidential election as of December 31, 1972 compared with $38.7 million, reported by Senator George McGovern for a total of $98.9 million. Minor party committees supporting 8 minor party candidates for President and 3 independent candidates for President in 1972 reported contributions of $1,043,000.

72. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1975, the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, the total raised by Nixon would be $24,470,000 compared with $24,540,000 raised by McGovern. Minor party committees supporting a 1972 Presidential candidate and independent Presidential candidates still would have raised a total of $977,000 in individual contributions.

73. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, $33,100,000 in individual contributions

[000111]

to Nixon would have been eliminated, $13,225,000 in individual contributions to McGovern would have been eliminated, and $66,000 in individual contributions to all minor party and independent Presidential candidates would have been eliminated. It would have thus eliminated 55 percent of Nixon's total contributions, 34 percent of McGovern's total contributions and 6 percent of the total contributions to all minor party and independent candidates for President.

74. The major party challenger to the incumbent President in 1972 reported raising 39.1 percent of the total funds raised by these two candidates and 64.3 percent of the funds raised by the incumbent. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, the major party challenger would have raised 48.5 percent of the total funds raised by these two candidates and 94 percent of the funds raised by the incumbent.

75. The minor party and independent candidates for President in 1972 reported raising 1.04 percent of the total funds reported raised by all Presidential candidates who ran in the general election and 1.05

[000112]

percent of the total raised by the major party nominees for President. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, the minor party and independent candidates would have raised 1.81 percent of the total funds raised by all Presidential candidates who ran in the general election and 1.85 percent of the total funds raised by the two major party nominees for President.

76. During the period from April 7, 1972 until December 31, 1972, Governor George Wallace reported total contributions of $1,590,000 with respect to his Presidential campaign. Wallace dropped out of the race following his shooting. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, $72,011 or 4.5 percent of the total contributions would be eliminated.

Congressional Contributions From Interest Groups – 1974

77. The 1,161 candidates for Congress who ran in the 1974 general elections reported total contributions of $73,483,613 for the period September 1,

[000113]

1973 through December 31, 1974.

78. If contributions in excess of $5,000 from registered special interest groups (*i.e.*, registered political committees that are not political committees of political parties and that are not political committees exclusively supporting one candidate) were eliminated, this would have eliminated $923,887 in contributions to these 1,161 candidates (not counting loans).

79. The $923,887 given by registered interest groups over a $5,000 limit per candidate represents 1.3 percent of the $73,483,613 raised by general election candidates during this period.

80. Of this $923,887 in contributions over and above a $5,000 limit per candidate, $513,560 went to incumbents compared with $167,601 which went to challengers to incumbents. The remaining $242,726 went to major party candidates in open races not involving an incumbent. None of these funds went to minor party or independent candidates.

81. If contributions in excess of $10,000 from registered special interest groups were eliminated, this

[000114]

would have eliminated $410,486 in contributions to these 1,161 candidates (not counting loans).

82. The $410,486 represents 6/10ths of 1 percent of the $73,483,618 raised by general election candidates during this period.

83. Of this $410,486 in contributions over and above a $10,000 contribution limit per candidate, $266,063 went to incumbents compared with $67,584 which went to challengers to incumbents. The remaining $76,839 went to candidates in open races not involving an incumbent. None of these funds went to minor party or independent candidates.

Congressional Contributions From Interest Groups – 1972

84. The 1,115 candidates for Congress who ran in the 1972 general elections reported total contributions of $62,285,985 for the period April 7, 1972 through December 31, 1972 (not including cash on hand as of April 7, 1972).

85. If contributions in excess of $5,000 from registered special interest groups were eliminated, this would have eliminated $884,297 in contributions to these 1,115 candidates (not counting loans).

[000115]

86. The $884,297 given by registered interest groups over and above a $5,000 limit per candidate represents 1.4 percent of the $62,285,985 raised by general election candidates during this period.

87. Of this $884,297 in contributions over and above a $5,000 limit per candidate, $368,731 went to challengers to incumbents, compared with $210,325 which went to incumbents. The remaining $305,241 went to candidates in open races not involving an incumbent.

88. If contributions in excess of $10,000 from registered special groups were eliminated, this would have eliminated $329,656 in contributions to these 1,115 candidates.

89. The $329,656 represents 1/2 of 1 percent of the $62,285,985 raised by general election candidates during this period.

90. Of this $329,656 in contributions over and above a $10,000 contribution limit per candidate, $149,012 went to challengers to incumbents compared with $47,653 which went to incumbents. The remaining $132,991 went to candidates in open races not involving an incumbent.

[000116]

Contributions From Individuals to 1974 Congressional Candidates Aggregating Over $25,000

91. During the period from September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, 15 individuals each gave contributions aggregating more than $25,000 in amounts of $500 or more, to Congressional candidates for a total of $682,018 (not counting loans). This amount represents less than 1 percent of the total contributions given during that period. If aggregate contributions from an individual to all candidates in excess of $25,000 during this period were eliminated, this would have eliminated $307,018 in contributions from these individuals.

92. If during the period September 1, 1973 though December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, $484,818 given by these 15 contributors or more than $25,000 each would have been eliminated. This represents

7/10ths of 1 percent of the total contributions of $73,483,613 given during the period. Of the $484,818 in amounts over and above $1,000 per contribution, $192,650 went to incumbents compared with $95,100 which went to challengers to incumbents. If the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 per

[000117]

candidate were eliminated, about twice as much would be eliminated from the incumbent totals as from the totals for challengers to incumbents. An additional $197,068 was given to candidates in open races.

93. During the period from September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, H. Ross Perot made 26 contributions to 1974 Congressional candidates in amounts of $500 and over, totaling $75,900. Twenty-four of these 26 donations were made after October 24, 1974, and thus were not available as part of the public record prior to the 1974 general elections (the final campaign disclosure reports prior to the November elections covered a period ending on October 24). Twenty-five of the 26 contributions went to incumbent members of Congress (including 2 who were defeated in the November election). Perot is Chairman of the Board of Electronic Data Systems, Inc., of Dallas, one of the largest suppliers to the government of data processing for medicare and medicaid programs. The Ways and Means Committee has jurisdiction in the House over medicare and medicaid programs, which are administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

94. Perot made contributions to 12 members of

[000118]

the Ways and Means Committee during this period totaling $31,900. Two of the contributions went after the election to members of the Committee who were unopposed in the primary or general election, Omar Burleson (D-Tex.), who received $5,000, and Joe Waggoner (D-La.) who received $5,000. Other contributions included $2,500 to Donald Clancy (R-Ohio), $2,500 to James Corman (D-Cal.), $2,500 to Joe Karth (D-Minn.), $2,500 to Dan Rostenkowski (D-Ill.), $1,500 to Herman Schneebeli (R-Pa.), $1,000 to Phil Landrum (D-Ga.), $1,000 to Al Ullman (D-Oreg.), $900 to Bill Archer (R-Tex.), $5,000 to Joel Broyhill (R-Va.), and $2,500 to Donald Brotzman (R-Colo.). The latter 2 were defeated in the general election and both received their contributions after they lost.

In addition, Perot contributed $2,500 to Rep. James Jones (D-Okla.) and $500 to Rep. James Martin (R-NC). Both received their contributions on December 30, 1974, approximately 2 weeks after they were named to serve on the Ways & Means Committee in the upcoming Congress.

Perot's House contribution also included $2,500 to Rep. Dan Flood (D-Pa.) who serves as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of

[000119]

Health, Education and Welfare. HEW has responsibility for administering medicare and medicaid programs. Perot also contributed $2,500 each to Reps. John Young (D-Tex.) (unopposed in the primary and general elections), Jim Wright (D-Tex.), Bob Wilson (R-Cal.) and James Collins (R-Tex.). All but the Collins contribution were made after the election.

95. The Finance Committee has jurisdiction in the Senate over medicare and medicaid programs. Perot gave $16,000 to members of the Senate Finance Committee who were running for re-election, including $5,000 each to Mike Gravel (D-Alaska), Robert Packwood (R-Oreg.) and Herman Talmadge (D-Ga.), and $1,000 to Russell Long, Chairman of the Finance Committee, who was unopposed in the general election.

In addition, Perot gave $5,000 each to Senators Milton Young (R-ND) and Daniel Inouye (D-Hawaii), and $2,500 to Richard Stone (D-Fla.). Stone, the successful Florida candidate for Senate, received his contribution after he won the election.

Of the $75,900 in total contributions given by Perot, $50,900 went to members of Congress associated with either the Ways and Means Committee or the Finance

[000120]

Committee. Eighteen of the 26 candidates who received contributions were associated with one of these two committees.

Interest Group Contributions – 1974

96. During the period from September 1, 1973 through October 14, 1974, registered interest groups (not including political parties) contributed $8.5 million directly to candidates in the 1974 Congressional elections.

97. Labor groups contributed more than $4.3 million during the period September 1, 1973 to October 14, 1974, while business and professional groups gave some $3.3 million. The latter total includes $1.6 million from business groups, $1.5 million from health groups, and $182,000

from agriculture groups. Miscellaneous and ideological groups contributed the remaining $887,000.

98. Incumbents received $5.2 million of the $8.5 million total given during this period compared with $1.7 million received by challengers to incumbents, a margin of better than 3 to 1. The bulk of the remainder went to races in which no incumbent was involved. Labor

[000121]

groups gave $2.3 million to incumbents compared with $1.1 million to challengers to incumbents, a margin of better than 2 to 1. Business and professional groups gave $2.6 million to incumbents compared with $254,000 to challengers to incumbents, a margin of 10 to 1.

99. During the period from September 1, 1973 through October 14, 1974, the interest groups that made the largest amount of contributions to Congressional candidates through political action committees included: the American Medical Association, $1,093,860; the AFL-CIO, $918,284; the United Auto Workers, $651,426; the maritime-related unions, $479,014; the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, $301,405; financial institutions, $247,861; the National Education Association (and its state affiliated committees), $229,080; the United Steelworkers of America, $215,925; the National Association of Manufacturers, $214,800; and the National Association of Realtors, $197,200.

100. During the period from September 1, 1973 through October 14, 1974, the leading recipients among Senate general election candidates of contributions from labor groups, included John Glenn (D-Ohio), $148,900;

Senator Birch Bayh (D-Ind.), $141,200; Senator Mike Gravel (D-Alaska), $111,400; Bill Roy (D-Kan.), $84,700; John Culver (D-Iowa), $80,700; Senator Richard Schweiker (R-Pa.), $79,000; Senator Warren Magnuson (D-Wash.), $76,500; Senator Thomas Eagleton (D-Mo.), $70,000; Senator Alan Cranston (D-Cal.), $58,700; and Wendell Ford (D-Ky.), $53,800.

101. The leading recipients among Senate general election candidates from business/professional groups during this period included, Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), $110,500; Senator Alan Cranston (D-Cal.), $51,000; Senator Robert Dole (R-Kan.), $46,100; Senator Marlow Cook (R-Ken.), $40,600; Senator Herman Talmadge (D-Ga.), $40,200; Senator Robert Packwood (R-Oreg.), $39,600; Senator Russell Long (D-La.), $33,800; Senator Warren Magnuson (D-Wash.), $33,000; Senator Peter Dominick (R-Colo.), $32,700; and E. J. Garn (R-Utah), $23,500. Senators Cranston and Magnuson were among the top ten recipients of contributions from both labor groups and business/professional groups.

102. During the period from September 1, 1973 through October 14, 1974, the leading recipients among House general election candidates of contributions from

labor groups included: Rep. Frank Clark (D-Pa.), $35,800; John Reuther (D-Mich.), $35,100; Robert Carr (D-Mich.), $31,800; Abner Mikva (D-Ill.), $27,800; Rep. Edward Mezvinsky (D-Iowa), $26,300; Paul Simon (D-Ill.), $24,700; Bill Clinton (D-Ark.), $24,200; Rep. John Dent (D-Pa.), $22,200; Fran Ryan (D-Ohio), $21,800 and Rep. Pat Schroeder (D-Colo.), $21,600.

103. During the period from September 1, 1973 through October 14, 1974, the leading recipients among House general election candidates of contributions from business/professional groups included Rep. Victor Veysey (R-Cal.), $31,900; Rep. Joel Broyhill (R-Va.), $31,900; Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.), $30,000; Rep. William Hudnut, $29,900; Rep. John Rhodes (R-Ariz.), $28,800; Rep. Robert Mathias (R-Cal.), $28,600; Rep. Dan Kuykendall (R-Tenn.), $26,800; Rep. Donald Brotzman (R-Colo.), $26,700. Rep. Richard Shoup (R-Mont.), $21,300; and Rep. William Scherle (R-Iowa), $20,400.

104. During the 1974 Congressional elections, there were 120 registered interest groups that gave contributions on 278 occasions to two or more candidates running for the same office. The contributions given in this manner totalled $676,897.

105. There are presently 37 members of the House Ways and Means Committee (including 18 who were members in the 93rd Congress). This Committee has jurisdiction over tax, social security, health insurance, and trade matters, among others. Of the 37 Committee members, 6 ran unopposed in the 1974 general election and 2 did not accept any contributions from registered interest groups. The remaining 29 members received $441,103 in contributions from special interest groups during the 1974 elections. This included $225,769 from labor groups and $215,234 from business/professional groups. The latter included $121,614 from business groups and $87,720 from health groups.

In addition, two members of the Ways and Means Committee in the previous Congress were defeated in the November, 1974 election and one member was killed in

a plane crash following his re-election. These three former members of the Committee received a total of $98,652 in contributions from interest groups in the 1974 election.

106. A political committee representing the securities industry (the Securities Industry Political Action Committee) contributed $18,600 to 11 members of

[000125]

the House Ways and Means Committee in the 93rd Congress. The Ways and Means Committee has jurisdiction over all tax matters, including tax issues relevant to the securities industry. All but one of the contributions (a $100 donation to Rep. Donald Brotzman (R-Colo.)) were made on October 30, 1974 or thereafter. Since the last campaign finance disclosure report due before the November elections covered a period ending on October 24, 1974, 10 of the 11 contributions by this interest group were not available as part of the public record prior to the election. Two of the ten contributions went to candidates who were unopposed in the primary and general election, Rep. Omar Burleson (D-Tex.), who received $3,000 and Rep. Joe Waggoner (D-La.) who received $3,000. Other contributions included: Rep. Jerry Pettis (R-Cal.), $3,000; Rep. Donald Clancy (R-Ohio), $1,500; Rep. John Duncan (R-Tenn.), $1,500; Rep. Joe Karth (D-Minn.), $1,500; Rep. Dan Rostenkowski (D-Ill.), $1,500; Rep. Herman Schneebeli (R-Pa.), $1,500; Rep. Phil Landrum (D-Ga.), $1,000; and Rep. Al Ullman (D-Oreg.), $1,000. Of the ten contributions, six went to Democrats and four went to Republicans.

107. During the period September 1, 1974 through December 31, 1974, individuals affiliated with

[000126]

the oil industry made campaign contributions of more than $340,000 to four members of the Senate Finance Committee who either ran for re-election in 1974 or were raising funds for a 1976 Presidential campaign. The Finance Committee has jurisdiction over key issues affecting the oil industry such as the oil import quota program. The contributions from individuals affiliated with the oil industry included $135,000 to Senator Lloyd Bentsen (D-Tex.), a Democratic Presidential candidate; $81,000 to Senator Robert Dole (R-Kan.), $73,000 to Senator Mike Gravel (D-Alaska); and $53,000 to Senator Russell Long (D-La.), Chairman of the Committee. Long was unopposed in the 1974 election and won his primary against two opponents with 75 percent of the vote. More than 50 percent of Gravel's oil-related contributions or $37,765 was donated after the November, 1974 election, including some $28,000 given at a Dallas, Texas, fundraising event for the Alaskan Senator.

108. During the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, political committees of maritime-related unions gave $22,200 to Rep. Frank Clark (D-Pa.) and $22,000 to Rep. Frank Clark (D-Pa.) and $22,000 to Senator Russell Long (D-La.). Clark, defeated in the November elections, served as Chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the House

[000127]

Committee on Merchant Marine & Fisheries. Long, unopposed in the 1974 general election and a winner of his primary with 75 percent of the vote, served as Chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee. Both of these subcommittees handled legislation of vital interest to the maritime unions.

109. During the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the political arm of the Teamsters Union in Alaska made contributions to three of the candidates in the Alaska Senate race. Incumbent Senator Mike Gravel received $3,100, while his Democratic primary challenger, Eugene Guess received $3,000 and Terry Miller, an unsuccessful Senate candidate in the Republican primary, received $4,500.

110. During the period from September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the American Medical Association (AMA) through its national political committee and the political arm of its California affiliate, gave a total of $225,678 to 40 California House candidates in the 1974 election.

The AMA gave contributions totaling $151,165 to 29 of the 37 California incumbents who faced

[000128]

major party opposition. This included 17 incumbent Republicans and 12 incumbent Democrats, ranging in ideological spectrum from Republican conservatives, John Rousselot and Barry Goldwater, Jr., to Democratic Liberals, Ron Dellums and John Burton, Jr. Major contributions to incumbents included $22,649 to Bob Mathias (along with $6,000 to his Democratic challenger, John Krebs), $21,625 to Victor Veysey and $15,000 to Burt Talcott.

Only 2 challengers to incumbents in California received AMA contributions for a total of $6,250. In both cases, the incumbents in those races received larger contributions from the AMA than their challengers.

There were 5 open races in California not involving an incumbent in the general election. The AMA gave $68,363 to 9 candidates in those 5 races. In the 7th

Congressional District, Democratic winner, George Miller, received $3,000 while his Republican opponent, Gary F Fernandez received $1,363. In the 13th Congressional District, Democratic winner Norman Mineta received $5,000 while his Republican opponent, George Milias, received $6,000. In addition, Antony C.

[000129]

Gualtieri, a loser in the RGpublican primary, received $5,000.

In the 24th Congressional District, Democratic winner Henry Waxman received $9,000. In the 34th Congressional District, Democratic winner Jerry Patterson received $1,000 while his Republican opponent David Rehman received $28,000.

The AMA also gave $10,000 each to Senator Alan Cranston and H.L. Richardson, his Republican opponent. In addition, the California arm of the AMA gave $5,000 to the REpublican candidate for the Senator in Nevada, Paul Laxalt.

111. During the period from September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the American Dental Association (ADA) through its national political committee and the political arm of its California affiliate gave a total of $70,500 to 37 California House candidates in the 1974 general election.

The ADA gave contributions totaling $60,500 to 32 of the 37 California incumbents w. o faced major party opposition. This included 17 incumbent Democrats

[000130]

and 15 incumbent Republicans, ranging in ideological spectrum from Republican conservative, Barry Goldwater,

Jr., to Democratic liberal Ron Dellums. Major contributions to incumbents included $4,000 each to Democrats John Moss and James Corman and Republicans Don Clausen and Bob Wilson. No challenger to an incumbent received any contribution. In the 5 open races not involving an incumbent, 5 candidates received a total of $10,500 from the ADA. These ranged in size from $500 to Democratic winner Henry Waxman in the 24th to $3,000 to Republican loser David Rehman in the 38th.

The ADA also gave $5,000 to Senator Alan Cranston and $500 to Earl Brian who lost in the Republican Senate primary.

Independent Expenditures

112. According to a report issued on November 14, 1973, by the General Accounting Office, a total of $98,060 in independent expenditures by 21 individuals was reported under Section 305 of the FECA of 1971 with respect to the 1972 Presidential elections.

113. During the period September 1, 1973, through December 31, 1974, a total of $15,802 in

[000131]

expenditures by 13 individuals and one group was reported under Section 305 with respect tothe 1974 Congressional elections.

114. The check-off method of generating funds for political campaigns involves more families from income levels below $5,000 than any other method of financing political campaigns. The following chart tabulates the percentage of families contributing to campaign by income class and by type of participation:

[000132]

Income[a] Class	Private Contributors[b]	Tax Deductions[c]		Tax Credits[c]		Tax Check-Off
	U.S. 1972	U.S. 1972	Calif. 1970	U.S. 1972	Ore. 1970	Iowa 1973
$ 0 - 4,999	3.7%	* %	.2%	.4%	.02%	12.0%
5,000 - 9,999	11.5	*	.7	2.2	.1	9.8
10,000 - 14,999	11.7	1.3	1.7	2.8	.4	12.6
15,000 - 19,999	19.8	2.6[d]	3.3	3.5[d]	1.2)	15.3
20,000 and more	32.0	5.7[d]	9.2	5.1[d]	5.9)	
TOTAL	12.4%	1.0%	2.1%	2.1%	.5%	11.9%

* Sample too small for reliable tabulation.

[a] Total family income in first column; adjusted gross income in all others.

[b] Number of families contributing. Based on Twentieth Century Fund Survey on Political Finance, by National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago.

[c] Based on number of returns taking deductions and credits.

[d] Estimated. Included proportionate distribution between two income classes of IRS information provided for the two combined.

Sources: U.S. Internal Revenue Service, California Franchise Tax Board, Oregon Department of Revenue, Iowa Department of Revenue

Prepared by David Adamany, Secretary of Revenue, State of Wisconsin

[000133]

115. At plaintiffs' suggestion defendants have performed additional computations with respect to paragraphs 52-61 and 91-92 supra) (pars. 58-66 and 100-101 of the April 21, 1975 Conway affidavit), on the basis of additional information and assumptions relating to loans. These conputations are based on the assumptions described in paragraph 2, supra, with the following differences:

(a) In lieu of paragraph 2(d), supra, substitute the following: Contributions are defined as total campaign receipts less refunds and rebates.

(b) In lieu of paragraph 2 (e), supra, insert the following: In determining the amounts of individual contributions over and above $1,000 per contribution in the 1974 House and Senate elections loans are included, and the following are no not included: (i) cash on hand as of September 1, 1973, since it is not possible to determine how much of these funds represent conttributions over $1,000 and (ii) contributions by candidates to their own campaigns since under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and the 1974 Amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act, House candidates can contribute up to $25,000 and Senate candidates up to $35,000 for their own campaigns.

[000134]

The computations of paragraphs 52-60 and 91-92 based on the additional assumptions and information are as follows:

52. The 1161 candidates for Congress who ran in the 1974 general elections reported contributions of $75,269,291 for the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974. An additional $3,687,603 was held as cash on hand by these candidates on September 1, 1973, for an overall total of $78,965,894 in funds available for the 1974 elections. The cash on hand funds represent contributions received prior to September 1, 1973, and for the most part are funds carried over from past elections. Of the $78,956,894 in total funds available reported by these candidates, major party candidates reported contributions of $77,677,287 compared with $1,279,607 in contributions

reported by minor party and independent candidates.

53. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974 the excess of individual contributions in excess of $1,000 per

[000135]

candidate were subtracted from the total raised, the total contribution figure to these 1161 candidates would be $5,521,469 less.

54. The $5,521,469 given by individuals over and above a $1,000 limit per candidate represents 7.3 percent if the $75,269,291 in contributions raised during the period September 1, 1973, through December 31, 1974.

55. Of the $5,521,469 in contributions over and above a $1,000 limit per candidate, $1,822,987 went to incumbents,ccompared with $1,318,440 which went to major party challengers to incumbents. If the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 per candidate were eliminated, about one and one-half as much would be eliminated from the incumbent totals as from the totals for major party challengers to incumbents. ($2,286,070 went to major party candidates in open races not involving an incumbent.)

56. $93,972 of the $5,521,469 in contributions over and above a $1,000 limit went to minor party and independent candidates. This

[000136]

represents 1.70 percent of the total funds raised over and above a $1,000 limit during the period. It also represents 7.34 percent of the $1,279,607 in total

contributions reported by independent and minor party candidates.

57. Incumbents who ran in the general election reported contributions during the period September 1, 1973, through December 31, 1974, of $36,123,885 compared with $20,276,551 reported by major party challengers to incumbents in the general election, for a total of $56,400,-436. The major party challengers therefore reported raising 35.95 percent of the $56,400,436 total and 56.13 percent of the funds raised by incumbents.

58. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, the totals raised by incumbents would be $34,300,898 compared with $18,958,111 raised by major party challengers to incumbents in the general election for a total of $53,259,009. Major party

[000137]

challengers, therefore, would have raised 35.60 percent of the $53,259,009 total and 55.27 percent of the funds raised by incumbents.

59. Major party candidates who ran in the general election reported contributions during the period of September 1, 1973, through December 31, 1974, of $73,988,684 compared with $1,279,607 reported by minor party and independent candidates for a total of $75,269,291. Minor party and independent candidates therefore reported raising 1.70 percent of the $75,269,291 total and 1.73 percent of the funds raised by major party candidates.

60. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions

over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, the totals raised by major party candidates would be $68,562,187 compared with $1,185,635 raised by minor party and independent candidates for a total of $69,747,-822. Minor party and independent candidates therefore would have raised 1.70 percent of the $69,747,822 total and

[000138]

1.73 percent of the funds raised by major party candidates.

91. During the period from September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, 21 individuals each gave contributions aggregating more than $25,000 in amounts of $500 or more, to Congressional candidates for a total of $879,665. This amount represents 1.2 percent of the total contributions given during that period. If aggregate contributions from an individual to all candidates in excess of $25,000 during this period were eliminated, this would have eliminated $354,665 in contributions from these individuals.

92. If during the period September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974, the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 were subtracted from the total contributions, $675,456 given by these 21 contributors of more than $25,000 each would have been eliminated. This represents less than 1 percent of the total contributions of $75,269,-291 given during the period. Of the $675,465 in amounts over and

[000139]

above $1,000 per contribution, $192,650 went to incumbents compared with $156,942 which went to challengers

to incumbents. If the excess of individual contributions over $1,000 per candidate were eliminated, about one and one-fourth as much would be eliminated from the incumbent totals as from the totals for challengers to incumbents. An additional $325,873 was given to candidates in open races.

117. Contributors Who Gave More Than $20,000 to Congressional Candidates

The following table list alphabetically the 36 contributors who each gave more than $20,000 in total to Congressional candidates in the November, 1972 election. The total figure is in the center column. The other columns show how the contributions were distributed between parties and incumbents and non-incumbents. The "CHALL" column shows contributions to challengers who opposed an incumbent candidate. The "NEITHER" column shows contributions to candidates who ran in races where there was no incumbent. The figures cover both Senate and House races.

The full identity of the contributors listed

[00140]

below, and the names of the candidates and the amounts they received are printed in paragraph 118, *infra*.

[00141]

NAME	REP	DEM	OTHER	TOTAL	INCUM	CHALL	NEITHER
Adler	$ 0	$24,976	$ 0	$24,976	$ 0	$24,976	$ 0
Bernstein	4,000	21,000	2,500	27,500	9,500	8,000	10,000
Blodgett	37,500	0	0	37,500	33,000	1,000	3,500
Brophy	25,000	0	0	25,000	0	25,000	0
Burrell	21,500	0	0	21,500	12,500	1,500	7,500
Davis	2,000	74,000	0	76,000	41,000	8,000	27,000
Etcheverry	1,750	38,000	500	40,250	12,500	21,750	6,000
Goldblum **	0	49,440	0	49,440	33,600	12,960	2,880
Grimson	0	26,000	0	26,000	7,000	8,000	11,000
Johnson	27,500	0	0	27,500	15,250	3,500	8,750
Kirkpatrick	0	0	25,000	25,000	0	0	25,000
Lasker	0	39,000	0	39,000	28,500	3,500	7,000
May	108,000	0	2,000	110,000	54,000	15,500	40,500
Miller	19,080	12,500	1,500	33,080	25,000	6,080	2,000
Mulcahy	46,000	4,000	0	50,000	27,000	21,000	2,000
Noe	3,000	14,000	5,000	22,000	15,000	0	7,000
Olin	83,000	0	0	83,000	32,500	21,500	29,000

Palevsky	0	24,000	0	24,000	3,000	11,000	10,000
Payson	58,500	0	0	58,500	29,000	16,500	13,000
Peretz	0	33,544	0	33,544	4,500	20,953	8,091
Pew[1]	33,500	0	0	33,500	25,000	2,000	6,500
Pew[2]	5,500	0	0	5,500	5,500	0	0
Pew[3]	24,500	0	0	24,500	19,000	0	5,500
Riklis	0	23,500	0	23,500	15,000	1,000	7,500
Rollins	28,500	0	0	28,500	9,000	12,000	7,500
Rosenbloom	0	23,000	2,000	25,000	3,000	14,000	8,000
Saft **	0	71,500	0	71,500	59,500	9,500	2,500
Scaife	56,000	0	0	56,000	20,500	13,000	22,500
Scheuer	0	28,588	0	28,588	0	0	28,588
Segal	25,453	2,561	18,725	46,739	20,095	18,725	7,919

NAME	REP	DEM	OTHER	TOTAL	INCUM	CHALL	NEITHER
Simon	$22,190	$ 0	$ 0	$22,190	$16,606	$ 2,030	$ 3,554
Spencer	25,000	0	0	25,000	0	0	25,000
Stone	20,900	2,412	0	23,312	10,412	11,900	1,000
Towsley	24,000	0	0	24,000	24,000	0	0
Wallace	23,180	0	0	23,180	5,380	6,500	11,300
Weinberg**	0	87,087	0	87,087	52,195	14,400	20,492
TOTAL	725,553	599,108	57,225	1,381,886	668,038	335,774	378,074

1. Mary Ethel Pew
2. Estate of J.N. Pew
3. W. Crocker Pew

** Contributors Goldblum, Saft and Weinberg channeled their donations through the National Committee for the Re-Election of a Democratic Congress (known as the Strauss Committee). They were allowed to designate (earmark the funds) the candidates receiving their money. It is not known if all the earmarked money actually went to each of the designated candidates.

118. Major Contributors and Recipients in the 1972 Congressional Elections

This table lists alphabetically the 35 individuals who contributed at least $20,000 to candidates in the 1972 Congressional election. Under each contributor's name there is an alphabetical list of the candidates and the amounts they received.

Three contributors (Goldblum, Saft, Weinberg) channeled their funds through the National Committee for the Re-Election of a Democratic Congress (called the Strauss Committee) but earmarked the money for specific candidates. The candidates listed for those contributors are those for whom the money was earmarked: it is not known if the earmarked amounts actually were given to each of the candidates.

*Indicates the candidate was an incumbent. The column following a name lists the candidate's state and congressional district.

HELEN & ROBERT ADLER — CHICAGO, ILLINOIS — INVESTOR

Ottinger, Richard	D	NY 23	$24,976
		TOTAL	$24,976

CAROL BERNSTEIN — SCARSDALE, NEW YORK — HOUSEWIFE

Abourezk, James	D	SD SEN	$ 1,000	Holtzman, Elizabeth	D	NY 16	$ 500
Abzug, Bella	D*	NY 20	2,000	Kerry, John F.	D	MA 05	4,000
Aspin, Les	D*	WI 01	500	Lowenstein Allard	LIB	NY 14	2,500
Biden, Joseph R.	D	DE SEN	1,000	McCloskey, Paul	R*	CA 17	3,000
Brademas, John	D*	IN 03	500	Miller, Howard M.	R	MA 09	1,000
Brown, George E.	D	CA 38	4,000	Morse, Wayne	D	OR SEN	2,000
Camacho, Julian	D	CA 12	500	Schroeder, Patricia	D	CO 01	500
Conyers, John	D*	MI 01	1,000	Thoresen, Walter P.	D	WI 03	500
Dellums, Ronald	D*	CA 07	500	Young, Andrew	D	GA 05	500
Drinan, Robert F	D*	MA 04	2,000				
				TOTAL			$ 27,500

JOHN W. BLODGETT, JR. GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN LUMBER & BANKING

Baker, Lamar	R*	TN 03	$ 3,000	Mailliard, William	R*	CA 06	3,000
Bloom,Allen	R	IN 04	500	Neal, Joseph G	R	WV 04	3,000
Cochran, Thad	R	MS 04	500	Peyser, Peter A.	R*	NY 23	3,000
Dennis, David W.	R*	IN 10	3,000	Powell, Walter	R*	OH 08	3,000
Esch, Marvin	R*	MI 02	1,000	Shoup, Richard G.	R*	MT 01	2,500
Griffin, Robert	R*	MI SEN	6,000	Schwengel, Fred	R*	IA 01	500
Harvey, James	R*	MI 08	3,000	Thurmond, Strom	R*	SC SEN	1,000
Ketchum, William	R	CA 36	500	Tower, John G.	R*	TX SEN	3,000
Lloyd, Sherman	R*	UT 02	500	Zwach, John M	R*	MN 06	500

TOTAL $ 37,500

484

TRUMAN W. BROPHY III ACAPULCO, MEXICO

Brophy, Bill	R	CA 30	$25,000	TOTAL	$25,000

[00145]

CONSTANCE MELLON BURRELL PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA MELLON FAMILY

Domenici, Peter	R	NM SEN	$ 1,500	Schneebeli, Herman	R*	PA 17	$ 2,500
Heinz, H. John III	R*	PA 18	10,000	Shuster, E.G.	R	PA 09	3,000
Hibbard, Henry S.	R	MT SEN	1,500	Thompson, Fletcher	R	GA SEN	1,500
Hirsch, Robert	R	SD SEN	1,500				

TOTAL $21,500

485

MR & MRS LEONARD DAVIS NEW YORK, NEW YORK FOUNDER PENN COLONIAL (INSURANCE GROUP)

Anastasi, Joseph	D	MD 08	$ 1,000	Green Edith	D*	OR 03	$ 1,000
Biden, Joseph R.	D	DE SEN	1,000	Green, William J	D*	PA 03	1,000
Blatnik, John A.	D*	MN 08	1,000	Hempelmann, John	D	WA 01	5,000
Brademas,John	D*	IN 03	5,000	Huddleston, Walter	D	KY SEN	5,000
Burke, Yvonne B.	D	CA 37	1,000	Jordan, Barbara	D	TX 18	1,000
Carey, Hugh	D*	NY 15	1,000	McCarthy, Richard	D	NY 36	1,000
Daniels, Jack	D	NM SEN	5,000	Metcalf, Lee	D*	MT SEN	10,000
Drinan, Robert	D*	MA 04	1,000	Pell, Clairborne	D*	RI SEN	1,000
Edmondson, Ed	D	OK SEN	5,000	Reid, Ogden	D*	NY 24	10,000
Eilberg, Joshua	D*	PA 04	1,000	Sanders, Barefoot	D	TX SEN	5,000
Esch, Marvin	R*	MI 02	1,000	Spong, William B.	D*	VA SEN	5,000

Galifianakas, Nick	D	NC SEN	5,000	Steele, Robert	R*	CT 02	1,000
Grav, Kenneth	D*	IL 24	1,000	Widnall, William	R*	NJ 07	1,000
					TOTAL		$76,000

DOMINICK ETCHEVERRY NEW YORK, NEW YORK INVESTOR

Abourezk, James	D	SD SEN	$ 3,000	McCarthy, Richard	D	NY 36	$ 500
Anderson, William	D*	TN 06	500	McCloskey, Paul	R*	CA 17	500
Bergland, Robert	D*	MN 07	500	Merson, Alan	D	CO 04	500
Biden, Joseph R.	D	DE SEN	3,000	Metcalf, Lee	D*	MT SEN	2,000
Brown, George R.	D	CA 38	500	Mezvinsky, Edward	D	IA 01	500
Carr, M. Robert	D	MI 06	500	Mikva, Abner	D*	IL 10	500
Clark, Dick	D	IA SEN	3,000	Miller, Harold O.	D	VA 10	500
Davis, William	D	ID SEN	3,000	Mondale, Walter	D*	MN SEN	1,000
Dow, John G.	D*	NY 26	1,000	Ottinger, Richard	D	NY 23	500
Drinan, Robert	D*	MA 04	1,000	Owens, Wayne	D	UT 02	500
English, Jerry	D	NJ 12	500	Pell, Claiborne	D*	RI SEN	1,000
Fornos, Werner	D	MD 04	500	Pritchard, Joel	R	WA 01	500
Fithian, Floyd	D	IN 02	500	Roncalio, Teno	D*	WY 01	500
Goodrich, James	D	OH 12	500	Roush, J. Edward	D*	IN 01	500
Hathaway, William	D	ME SEN	3,000	Runnels, Harold	D*	NM 02	500
Jacobs, Andrew	D*	IN 11	1,000	Ruppert, James	D	OH 08	500
Kelley,Frank	D	MI SEN	3,000	Sharp, Philips	D	IN 10	500

Kerry, John	D	MA 05	500	Steelman, Alan	R	TX 05	750
Koch, Edward	D*	NY 18	500	Thompson, Frank	D*	NJ 04	1,000
Kucinich, Dennis	D	OH 23	500	Udall,Morris	D*	AZ 02	500
Lowenstein, Allard	LIB	NY 14	500				
					TOTAL		$40,250

[00146]

STANLEY GOLDBLUM**LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA FORMER PRESIDENT, EQUITY FUNDING CORP.

Anderson, Glenn	D*	CA 35	$960	Johnson, Harold T.	D*	CA 02	$960
Anderson, William	D*	TN 06	960	Kelley, Frank J.	D	MI SEN	6,000
Annunzio, Frank	D*	IL 11	960	Leggett, Robert L.	D*	CA 04	960
Aspin, Les	D*	WI 01	960	Melcher, John	D*	MT 02	960
Begich, Nick	D*	AK 01	960	Mikva, Abner J.	D*	IL 10	960
Brademas, John	D*	IN 03	1,920	Moss, John E.	D*	CA 03	1,920
Breckinridge, Frank	D	KY 06	960	McCormack, Mike	D*	WA 04	960
Burke, Yvonne B.	D	CA 37	1,920	McFall, John J.	D*	Ca 15	960
Burton, Phillip	D*	CA 05	960	McKay, Gunn	D*	UT 01	960
Byron, Goodloe	D*	MD 06	960	Obey, David R.	D*	WI 07	960
Corman, James C.	D*	CA 22	960	Olsen, Arnold	D	MT 01	960
Danielson, George	D*	CA 29	960	Rees, Thomas M.	D*	CA 26	960

Denholm, Frank E.	D*	SD	01	960	Roush, J.Edward	D*	IN	04	960
Dellums, Ronald	D*	CA	07	960	Roy, William R.	D*	KS	02	960
Edwards, Don	D*	CA	09	960	Roybal, Edward	D*	CA	30	960
Hanna, Richard T.	D*	CA	34	960	Sanders, Barefoot	D	TX	SEN	6,000
Hawkins, Augustus	D*	CA	21	960	Sisk, B.F.	D*	CA	16	960
Holifield, Chet	D*	CA	19	960	Van Deerlin, Lionel	D*	CA	41	960
Jacobs, Andrew	D*	IN	11	960	Waldie, Jerome	D*	CA	14	960
					TOTAL				49,440

488

BETTINA GRIMSON (MRS. S.B.) NEW YORK, NEW YORK RETIRED PHYSICIAN

Abourezk, James	D	SD	SEN	$ 2,000	Howard James	D*	NJ	03	$ 500
Anderson, William	D*	TN	06	1,000	Koch, Edward	D*	NY	18	500
Biden, Joseph R.	D	DE	SEN	3,000	McKeever,Patrick	D	SD	02	2,000
Bergland, Robert	D*	MN	07	1,000	Mikva, Abner	D*	IL	10	1,000
Clark, Dick	D	IA	SEN	3,000	Miller, Harold	D	VA	10	2,000
Davis, William	D	ID	SEN	3,000	Roncalio, Teno	D*	WY	01	1,000
Fornos, Werner	D	MD	04	2,000	Roy, William	D*	KS	02	1,000
Grasso, Ella T	D*	CT	06	1,000	Violette, Elmer	D	ME	02	2,000
					TOTAL				$ 26,000

** Contributors Goldblum, Saft and Weinberg channeled their donations through the National Committee for the Re-Election of a Democratic Congress (known as the Strauss Committee). They were allowed to designate (earmark the funds) the candidates receiving their money. It is not known if all the earmarked money actually went to each of the designated candidates.

[00147]

J. SEWARD JOHNSON NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY RETIRED CHAIRMAN JOHNSON & JOHNSON

489

Baker, Howard R.	R*	TN	SEN	$1,500	Ketchum, William	R	CA	36	$1,000
Brooke, Edward W.	R*	MA	SEN	2,500	Lujan, Manuel Jr.	R*	NM	01	500
Case, Clifford P.	R*	NJ	SEN	4,500	Mailliard, William	R*	CA	06	750
Frelinghuysen,Peter	R*	NJ	05	500	Miller, Jack	R*	IA	SEN	2,500
Gude, Gilbert	R*	MD	08	2,000	Peyser, Peter A.	R*	NY	23	500
Hawke, R. Jack	R	NC	04	500	Schiaffo, Alfred	R	NJ	09	1,500
Helms, Jesse	R	NC	SEN	750	Thompson, Fletcher	R	GA	SEN	5,000
Holt, Marjorie	R.	MD	04	1,500	Vergari, Carl	R	NY	24	1,000
Hudnut, William	R	IN	11	1,000	TOTAL				$27,500

V.H. KIRKPATRICK JONESBORO, LOUISIANA
CAR DEALER

McKeithen, John	IND	LA SEN	$25,000	
			TOTAL	$25,000

MARY WOODWARD LASKER NEW YORK, NEW YORK PHILANTHROPIST

Abourezk, James	D	SD SEN	$ 1,000	
Biden, Joseph R.	D	DE Sen	$ 1,000	
Corman, James C.	D*	CA 22	$ 1,000	
Daniels, Jack	D	NM SEN	$ 1,000	
Davis, William E.	D	ID SEN	$ 1,000	
Delaney, James	D*	NY 09	$ 1,000	
Edmondson, Ed	D	OK SEN	$ 1,000	
Flood, Daniel	D*	PA 11	$ 6,000	
Galifianakis, Nick	D	NC SEN	$ 2,000	
Grasso, Ella	D*	CT 06	$ 1,000	
Hansen, Julia B.	D*	WA 03	$ 1,000	
Haskell,Floyd K.	D	CO SEN	$ 1,000	
McIntyre, Thomas	D*	NH SEN	$ 1,000	
Meeds, Lloyd	D*	WA 02	$ 1,000	
Metcalf, Lee	D*	MT SEN	$ 1,000	
Mezvinsky, Edward	D	IA 01	$ 500	
Nunn, Sam, Jr.	D	GA SEN	$ 1,000	
Obey, David R.	D*	WI 07	$ 500	
O'Neill,Thomas P.	D*	MA 08	$ 2,000	
O'Hara, James	D*	MI 12	$ 1,000	
Pell, Claiborne	D*	RI SEN	$ 1,000	
Pepper, Claude	D*	FL 14	$ 1,000	
Rogers, Paul G.	D*	FL 11	$ 1,000	
Rooney, John J.	D*	NY 14	$ 1,000	
Roy, William R.	D*	KS 02	$ 1,000	
Sanders, Barefoot	D	TX SEN	$ 1,000	
Spong, William B.	D*	VA SEN	$ 1,000	
Staggers, Harley	D*	WV 02	$ 4,000	
Yates, Sidney R.	D*	IL 09	$ 1,000	
			TOTAL	$39,000

CORDELIA SCAIFE MAY PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA FINANCIER-MELLON FAMILY

Abdnor, James	R	SD 02	$ 2,500	Johnson, Albert W.	R*	PA 23	$ 1,000
Allott, Gordon	R*	CO SEN	$ 1,000	Kemp, Jack	R*	NY 38	$ 1,000
Ashbrook, John M	R*	OH 17	$ 1,000	Ketchum, William	R	CA 36	$ 1,500
Baker, Howard	R*	TN SEN	$ 1,000	Kuykendall, Dan	R*	TN 08	$ 1,500
Baker, Lamar	R*	TN 03	$ 1,500	Kyl, John H.	R*	IA 04	$ 1,500
Bartlett, Dewey F.	R	OK SEN	$ 3,000	Lamkin, Robert	R	IL 22	$ 1,500
Beard, Robin L.	R	TN 06	$ 1,500	Landgrebe,Earl F.	R*	IN 02	$ 1,500
Bethel, Paul D.	R	FL 13	$ 1,000	Lott, Trent	R	MS 05	$ 2,500
Beister, Edward G.	R*	PA 08	$ 500	McClure, James A.	R	ID SEN	$ 3,000
Catarinella, Roland	R	PA 14	$ 1,000	McDade, Joseph M.	R*	PA 10	$ 500
Chafee, John	R	RI SEN	$ 3,000	McKevitt, James D.	R*	CO 01	$ 1,500
Cohen, William	R	ME 02	$ 1,500	Miller, Jack	R*	IA SEN	$ 1,000
Collins, John T.	IC	MA 04	$ 2,000	Mitchell, Donald	R	NY 31	$ 1,500
Conlan, John B.	R	AZ 04	$ 2,500	Nunn, Louis B.	R	KY SEN	$ 3,000
Coughlin,Lawrence	R	PA 13	$ 500	Peyser, Peter A.	R*	NY 23	$ 1,500
Crane , Philip M.	R*	IL 12	$ 3,000	Pfender, William	R	PA 04	$ 2,000
Curtis, Carl T.	R*	NB SEN	$ 1,000	Powell, Walter E	R*	OH 08	$ 1,500
Dennis, David W.	R*	IN 10	$ 1,500	Price, Robert	R*	TX 13	$ 2,000
Dickenson, William	R*	AL 02	$ 1,500	Roberts, Courtney	R	TX 24	$ 1,500
Domenici, Peter	R	NM SEN	$ 2,000	Sandman, Charles	R*	NJ 02	$ 1,500
Dowd, William F	R	NJ 03	$ 1,500	Saylor, John P.	R*	PA 12	$ 1,000

Esch, Marvin	R*	MI	02	$ 1,500	Schneebeli, Herman	R*	PA	17	$ 1,000
Eshleman, Edwin	R*	PA	11	$ 500	Shoup, Richard P.	R*	MT	01	$ 1,500
Goldwater, BarryJR	R*	CA	27	$ 2,500	Shuster, E.G.	R	PA	09	$ 500
Goodling, George	R*	PA	19	$ 500	Snider, Howard J.	R	CA	38	$ 3,000
Griffin, Robert	R*	MI	SEN	$ 3,000	Thompson , FletcherR		GA	SEN	$ 3,000
Hansen, Clifford P.	R*	WY	SEN	$ 3,000	Thurmond, Strom	R*	SC	SEN	$ 3,000
Harvey, James	R*	MI	08	$ 1,500	Tower, John G.	R*	TX	SEN	$ 3,000
Hawke, R. Jack	R	NC	04	$ 2,500	Veysey,Victor	R	CA	43	$ 1,000
Helms, Jesse	R	NC	SEN	$ 3,000	Ware, John H. III	R*	PA	05	$ 500
Hibbard, Henry S.	R	MT	SEN	$ 3,000	Williams, Lawrence	R*	PA	07	$ 500
Hirsch, Robert W.	R	SD	SEN	$ 3,000	Zwach, John M	R*	MN	06	$ 1,500

492

TOTAL $110,000

MR. AND MRS. J. IRWIN MILLER COLUMBUS, IN . CHAIRMAN OF BOARD, CUMMINS ENGINE CO.

Blount, Winton M.	R	AL	SEN	$ 3,000	Lowenstein, Allard	L	NY	14	$ 1,500
Bohen, Fredrick	D	NJ	05	$ 1,000	McCloskey, Paul	R*	CA	17	$ 7,000
Brademas, John	D*	IN	03	$ 1,500	Mondale, Walter F.	D*	MN	SEN	$ 4,000
Case, Clifford	R*	NJ	SEN	$ 1,500	Percy, Charles H.	R*	IL	SEN	$ 6,000
Haaven, Jon	R	MN	07	$ 580	Ullman, Al	D*	OR	02	$ 1,000
Hamilton, Lee H.	D*	IN	09	$ 3,000	Young, Andrew	D*	GA	05	$ 2,000
Hatfield, Mark	R*	OR	SEN	$ 1,000					

TOTAL $33,080

[00149]

MR & MRS JOHN MULCAHY BRONXVILLE, NEW YORK FORMER PRES. QUIGLEY CO. (SUBSID. OF PFIZER INC.)

Gallagher, John T	R	NY	06	$ 2,000	Peyser, Peter	R*	NY	23	$23,000
Jackson, Laban	R	KY	06	2,000	Rogers, Paul	D*	FL	11	4,000
Langley,Jane	R	NY	18	2,000	Vergari, Carl	R	NY	24	17,000

TOTAL $50,000

493

JAMES A. NOE MONROE, LOUISIANA RADIO & TV OWNER (FORMER GOVERNOR OF LOUISIANA)

Eastland, James	D*	MS	SEN	$ 2,000	McKeithen,John	IND	LA	SEN	$ 5,000
Goldwater, B. (Jr)	R*	CA	27	1,000	Toledano,Ben	R	LA	SEN	1,000
McClellan, John	D*	AR	SEN	12,000	Treen, David	R	LA	03	1,000

TOTAL $22,000

J.M. OLIN ST. LOUIS, MOSSOURI HON CHM BD - OLIN CORPORATION (INDUST. & AGRIC. CHEMICALS)

Abdnor, James	R	SD	02	$ 500	Hirsch, Robert	R	SD	SEN	$ 3,000
Armstrong, William	R	CO	05	500	Holt, Marjorie	R	MD	04	500

Bafalis, L.A.	R	FL	10	500	Huber, Robert	R	MI	18	500
Bartlett, Dewey	R	OK	SEN	3,000	Hudnut, William	R	IN	11	500
Beard, Robin	R	TN	06	1,000	Hunt, William	R	PA	20	500
Bloom, Allan	R	IN	04	500	Insco, Jack	R	FL	05	500
Blount, Winton	R	AL	SEN	3,000	Jackson, Laban	R	KY	06	500
Boggs, J. Caleb	R*	DE	SEN	3,000	Ketchum, William	R	CA	36	500
Boyd, Joseph	R	NY	01	2,000	Kidd, Bill	R	WY	01	500
Bray, William	R*	IN	06	1,000	Kyl, John	R*	IA	04	500
Burgener, Clair	R	CA	42	500	Langley, Jane	R	NY	18	500
Chafee, John	R	RI	SEN	3,000	Lott, Trent	R	MS	05	500
Conlan, John	R	AZ	04	1,000	McClure, James	R	IN	SEN	3,000
Cook, Rodney	R	GA	05	500	McKinney, Stewart	R*	CT	04	500
Cooper, John,Jr.	R	MO	02	1,000	Miller, Jack	R*	IA	SEN	3,000
Countie, David	R	MO	08	500	Moseley, James	R	MA	06	1,000
Dennis, David	R*	IN	10	500	Nunn, Louis	R	KY	SEN	3,000
Domenici, Pete	R	NM	SEN	3,000	Percy, Charles	R*	IL	SEN	5,500
Findley, Paul	R*	IL	20	2,000	Price, Robert	R*	TX	13	1,500
Funsch, Richard	R	MO	01	1,000	Scott, William	R	VA	SEN	3,000
Goldwater, B.,Jr.	R*	CA	27	3,000	Sloan, Russell	R	MO	06	500
Griffin, Robert	R*	MI	SEN	3,000	Symms, Steven	R	IN	01	500
Hanrahan, Robert	R	IL	03	500	Thompson, Fletcher	R	GA	SEN	1,000
Hansen, Clifford	R*	WY	SEN	3,000	Thurmond, Strom	R*	SC	SEN	3,000
Hawke, R. Jack	R	NC	04	1,500	Tower, John	R*	TX	SEN	3,000
Helms, Jesse	R	NC	SEN	3,000	Treen, David	R	LA	03	500
Hibbard, Henry	R	MT	SEN	3,000	Vergari, Carl	R	NY	24	500
					TOTAL				$83,000

494

[00150]

MAX PALEVSKY LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA CHM XEROX DATA SYSTEMS

Anderson, William	D*	TN	06	$ 1,000	Helstoski,Henry	D*	NJ	09	$ 1,000
Burke, Yvonne B.	D	CA	37	10,000	Morse, Wayne L.	D	OR	SEN	10,000
Dow, John G.	D*	NY	26	1,000	Novak, Mark S.	D	CA	27	1,000
					TOTAL				$24,000

MRS. CHARLES S. (JOAN WHITNEY) PAYSON MANHASSET, NEW YORK
INVESTOR, OWNER N.Y. METS

495

Allott, Gordon	R	CO	SEN	$ 3,000	Hibbard, Henry S.	R	MT	SEN	$ 3,000
Baker, Howard H.	R*	TN	SEN	3,000	Hirsch, Robert W.	R	SD	SEN	3,000
Chafee, John H.	R	RI	SEN	5,000	Langley, Jane P.	R	NY	18	500
Cohen, William	R	ME	02	1,000	Lott, Trent	R	MS	05	3,000
Conlan, John B.	R	AZ	04	3,000	McClure, James A.	R	ID	SEN	3,000
Curtis, Carl T.	R*	NB	SEN	1,000	McKevitt, James D.	R*	CO	01	3,000
Dennis, David W.	R*	IN	10	3,000	Miller, Jack	R*	IA	SEN	3,000
Gilman, Benjamin	R	NY	26	3,000	Peyser, Peter A.	R*	NY	23	3,000
Griffin, Robert	R*	MI	SEN	4,000	Porteous, L. Robert	R	ME	01	1,000
Gustafson, Joel	R	FL	11	1,000	Snider, Howard J.	R*	CA	38	3,000
Hansen, Clifford	R*	WY	SEN	3,000	Tower, John G.	R*	TX	SEN	3,000
					TOTAL				$ 58,500

DR. & MRS. MARTIN PERETZ CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
HARVARD PROFESSOR

Badillo, Herman	D*	NY	21	$ 1,000	Kerry, John F.	D	MA	05	$ 2,092
Biden, Joseph R.	D	DE	SEN	2,500	Mezvinsky, Edward	D	IA	01	500
Brown, George E.	D	CA	38	1,500	Miller, Harold O.	D	VA	10	500
Burton, Philip	D*	CA	05	500	Morse, Wayne L.	D	OR	SEN	10,950
Camacho, Julian	D	CA	12	500	Schroeder, Patricia	D	CO	01	2,000
Dellums, Ronald	D*	CA	07	500	Sharp, Philip R.	D	IN	10	500
Dow, John G.	D*	NY	26	1,500	Studds, Gerry E.	D	MA	12	2,999
Drinan, Robert F.	D*	MA	04	1,000					
Holtzman, Elizabeth	D	NY	16	1,500					
Horowitz, Elaine	D	NY	04	3,503	TOTAL				$ 33,544

[00151]

MARY ETHEL PEW PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA STOCKHOLDER (SUN OIL CO.)

Andrews, Mark	R*	ND	01	$ 500	Johnson, Albert W.	R*	PA	23	$ 500
Arends, Leslie C.	R*	IL	15	500	McClure, James A.	R	ID	SEN	500
Bartlett, Dewey	R	OK	SEN	1,000	Mills, William O.	R*	MD	01	500
Biester, Edward	R*	PA	08	500	Pearson, James B.	R*	KS	SEN	3,000
Blackburn, Ben B.	R*	GA	04	1,000	Pettis, Jerry L.	R*	CA	33	500
Boggs, J Caleb	R*	DE	SEN	1,000	Quillen, James H.	R*	TN	01	500
Brown, Garry	R*	MI	03	500	Saylor, John P.	R*	PA	12	500
Broyhill, James T.	R*	NC	10	1,000	Scherle, William J.	R*	IA	05	500
Buchanan, John H.	R*	AL	06	500	Schwengel, William	R*	IA	01	500
Chaffee, John H.	R	RI	SEN	2,000	Shriver, Garner E.	R*	KS	04	500
Curtis, Carl T.	R*	NB	SEN	500	Skubitz, Joe	R*	KS	05	500
Devine, Samuel L.	R*	OH	12	500	Snyder, M. Gene	R*	KY	04	1,000
Domenici, Peter	R	NM	SEN	1,000	Spence, Floyd D.	R*	SC	02	500
Eshleman, Edwin	R*	PA	16	500	Stevens, Ted	R*	AK	SEN	2,000
Findley, Paul	R*	IL	20	500	Thurmond, Strom	R*	SC	SEN	2,000
Ford, Gerald R.	R*	MI	05	500	Tower, John G.	R*	TX	SEN	2,000
Frey, Louis, Jr.	R*	FL	09	500	Wampler, William C.	R*	VA	09	500

Hewgley, James W.	R	OK	01	2,000	Ware, John H. III	R*	PA	05	500
Hirsch, Robert W.	R	SD	SEN	2,000	Williams, Lawrence	R*	PA	07	500
					TOTAL				$33,500

ESTATE OF J.N. PEW PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA (SUN OIL CO)

Anderson, John B.	R*	IL	16	$ 500	Goodling, George	R*	PA	19	$ 500
Brotzman, Donald	R*	CO	02	1,000	McDade, Joseph M.	R*	PA	10	500
Duncan John J.	R*	TN	02	1,000	Rhodes, John J.	R*	AZ	01	500
Esch, Marvin L.	R*	MI	02	500	Ruth, Earl B.	R*	NC	08	500
Goldwater, Barry Jr	R*	CA	27	500					
					TOTAL				$ 5,500

498

[00152]

W. CROCKER PEW PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA DIRECTOR (SUN OIL CO.)

Arends, Leslie C.	R*	IL	15	$ 500	Pearson James B.	R*	KS	SEN	$ 1,000
Bartlett, Dewey F.	R	OK	SEN	3,000	Pettis, Jerry	R*	CA	33	500
Boggs, J. Caleb	R*	DE	SEN	1,000	Quillen, James H.	R*	TN	01	500
Curtis , Carl T.	R*	NB	SEN	500	Rhodes, John	R*	AZ	01	500
Domenici,Peter	R	NM	SEN	1,000	Saylor, John P.	R*	PA	12	500
Eshleman, Edwin	R*	PA	16	500	Scherle, William	R*	IA	05	500
Findley, Paul	R*	IL	20	500	Schwengel, Fred	R*	IA	01	500
Goodling, George	R*	PA	19	500	Shoup, Richard G.	R*	MT	01	500
Hansen, Clifford	R*	WY	SEN	2,000	Shriver, Garner	R*	KS	04	500
Hirsch, Robert W.	R	SD	SEN	1,000	Skubitz, Joe	R*	KS	05	500
Johnson, Albert W.	R*	PA	23	500	Steiger, Sam	R*	AZ	03	500
McClure, James W.	R	ID	SEN	500	Stevens, Ted	R*	AK	SEN	2,000
McCollister, John	R*	NB	02	500	Thurmond, Strom	R*	SC	SEN	1,000
McDade, Joseph M.	R*	PA	10	500	Tower, John G.	R*	TX	SEN	2,000
Minshall, William	R*	OH	23	500	Wampler, William	R*	VA	09	500
					TOTAL				$24,500

499

MESHULAM RIKLIS NEW YORK, NEW YORK CH BD RAPID AMERICAN CORP

Abourezk, James	D	SD	SEN	$ 500	Jacobs, Andrew	D*	IN	11	$ 500
Brademas, John	D*	IN	03	500	Mikva, Abner	D*	IL	10	500
Carey, Hugh L.	D*	NY	15	1,000	Reid, Ogden	D*	NY	24	5,000
Daniels, Jack	D	NM	SEN	1,500	Roncalio, Teno	D*	WY	01	500
Feeley, John M.	D	RI	01	500	Rooney, John J.	D*	NY	14	5,000
Fulton, Richard H.	D*	TN	05	500	Wolff, Lester	D*	NY	06	1,000
Hempelmann, John	D	WA	01	1,000	Young, Andrew	D	GA	05	5,000
Hungate, William	D*	MO	09	500					
					TOTAL				$23,500

JOHN W. ROLLINS WILMINGTON, DELAWARE
PRESIDENT, ROLLINS INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Bartlett, Dewey	R	OK	SEN	$ 1,000	Hinshaw, Andrew	R	CA	39	$ 3,000
Blount, Winton	R	AL	SEN	12,000	Percy, Charles	R*	IL	SEN	3,000
Cohen, William	R	ME	02	1,000	Thurmond, Strom	R*	SC	SEN	3,000
Domenici, Peter	R	NM	SEN	1,000	Towell, David	R	NV	01	1,000
DuPont, Pierre	R*	DE	01	3,000	Young, Edward	R	SC	06	500
					TOTAL				$ 28,500

[00153]

500

MR. AND MRS. CARROLL ROSENBLOOM, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
OWNER OF L. A. RAMS

Abourezk, James	D	SD	SEN	$ 2,000	Hathaway, William	D	ME	SEN	$ 2 000
Clark, Dick	D	IA	SEN	4,000	Huddleston, Walter	D	KY	SEN	2,000
Davis, William E.	D	ID	SEN	2,000	**Kelley, Frank**	D	MI	SEN	2,000
Droney, John L.	D	MA	SEN	3,000	Lowenstein, Al	LIB	NY	14	2,000
Galifianakis,Nick	D	NC	SEN	2,000	Pell, Claiborne	D*	RI	SEN	3,000
					TOTAL				$25,000

501

HOWARD E. SAFT**NEW YORK, NEW YORK OWNER, ADLAY JEWELRY

Anderson, William	D*	TN	06	$2,000	Jacobs, Andrew	D*	IN	11	$2,000
Bergland, Bob	D*	MN	07	1,000	Jones, Walter B.	D*	NC	01	800
Blanton, Ray	D	TN	SEN	2,000	Karth, Joseph E.	D*	MN	04	1,000
Brademas, John	D*	IN	03	1,500	Matsunaga, Spark	D*	HI	01	2,000
Burlison, Bill	D*	MO	10	2,000	Meeds, Lloyd	D*	WA	02	2,000
Carey, Hugh, L.	D*	NY	15	5,000	Melcher, John	D*	MT	02	1,000
Cotter, William	D*	CT	01	3,000	Mezvinsky,Edward	D	IA	01	1,000
Culver, John C.	D*	IA	02	1,000	Mikva, Abner	D*	IL	10	3,000
Evans, Frank E.	D*	CO	03	1,000	Murphy, John	D*	NY	17	1,000
Fornos, Werner	D	MD	04	1,000	Patterson, J.O.	D	TN	08	5,000
Fulton, Richard	D*	TN	05	2,000	Pike, Otis G.	D*	NY	01	1,000
Galifianakis,Nick	D	NC	Sen	1,500	Purcell, Graham	D*	TX	13	2,500
Giaimo, Robert N.	D*	CT	03	3,000	Roncalio, Teno	D*	WY	01	3,000
Grasso, Ella T.	D*	CT	06	3,000	Roy, William R.	D*	KS	02	5,000
Hanley, James	D*	NY	32	2,000	Runnels, Harold	D*	NM	02	1,000
Hansen, Julia	D*	WA	03	1,000	Shipley, George	D*	IL	22	1,000
Hathaway, William	D	ME	SEN	1,500	Smith, Neal	D*	IA	04	2,000
Hungate, William	D*	MO	09	1,000	Wolff, Lester	D*	NY	06	2,000
Ichord, Richard	D*	MO	08	1,000					
					TOTAL				71,500

** Contributors Goldblum, Saft and Weinberg channeled their donations through the National Committee for the Re-Election of a Democratic Congress (known as the Strauss Committee). They were allowed to designate (earmark the funds) the candidates receiving their money. It is not known of all the earmarked money actually went to each of the designated candidates.

[00154]

RICHARD MELLON SCAIFE — PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA — INDUSTRIALIST & FINANCIER

502

Allott, Gordon	R*	CO	SEN	$ 1,000	Lujan, Manuel	R*	NM	01	$ 1,000
Bafalis, L. A.	R	FL	10	500	Mailliard, William	R*	CA	06	1,000
Baker, Howard H.	R*	TN	SEN	1,000	Martin, James	R	NC	09	1,000
Bartlett, Dewey	R	OK	SEN	3,000	McAtee, Charles	R	KS	02	1,000
Beard, Robin L.	R	TN	06	1,000	McClure, James	R	ID	SEN	3,000
Chafee, John H.	R	RI	SEN	3,000	Miller, Jack	R*	IA	SEN	1,000
Cronin, Paul W.	R	MA	05	2,000	Robinson, Kenneth	R*	VA	07	500
Curtis, Carl T.	R*	NB	SEN	1,000	Schwengel, Fred	R*	IA	01	1,000
Domenici Pete	R	NM	SEN	3,000	Shuster, E.G.	R	PA	09	500
Ford, Gerald	R*	MI	05	2,500	Smith, Henry P. III	R*	NY	36	500
Griffin, Robert	R*	MI	SEN	5,000	Snyder, Howard J.	R	CA	38	1,000
Helms, Jesse I.	R	NC	SEN	3,000	Steele, Robert H.	R*	CT	02	1,000
Hibbard, Henry	R	MT	SEN	3,000	Talcott, Burt L.	R*	CA	12	500
Hirsch, Robert	R	SD	SEN	3,000	Thone, Charles	R*	NB	01	500
Huber, Robert	R	MI	18	500	Towell, David	R	NV	01	2,000
Hudnut, William	R	IN	11	1,000	Winn, Larry Jr.	R*	KS	03	500
Hunt, William R.	R	PA	20	3,000	Zwach, John M.	R*	MN	06	1,000
Kidd, Bill	R	WY	01	1,000					
Latta, Delbert	R*	OH	05	500				Total	$56,000
Lloyd, Sherman	R*	UT	02	1,000					

503

WALTER SCHEUER — CHILMARK, MASSACHUSETTS — BUSINESS

Kerry, John	D	MA	05	$ 28,588	$28,588
				Total	$28,588

MR. AND MRS. JOSEPH SEGAL — MARION, PENNSYLVANIA — PRESIDENT, FRANKLIN MINT

Barrett, William	D*	PA	01	$ 2,561	Johnson, Albert	R*	PA	23	$ 2,055
Coughlin, Lawrence	R*	PA	13	1,048	Lowenstein, Allard	LIB	NY	14	18,725
Domenici, Pete V.	R	NM	SEN	2,850	McClure, James A.	R	ID	SEN	2,166
Eshleman, Edwin	R	PA	16	1,048	McDade, Joseph M.	R*	PA	10	1,030

Ford, Gerald	R*	MI	05	2,546	Saylor, John P.	R*	PA	12	2,105
Goodling, George	R*	PA	19	1,005	Schneebeli, Herman	R*	PA	17	1,048
Hatfield, Mark	R*	OR	SEN	2,032	Ware, John H. III	R*	PA	05	2,617
Hirsch, Robert W.	R	SD	SEN	2,903	Williams, Lawrence	R*	PA	07	1,000
							TOTAL		$46,739

[00155]

MR. AND MRS. NORTON SIMON LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA FORMER CHAIRMAN NORTON SIMON,INC

Allott, Gordon	R*	CO	SEN	$ 2,714	Hatfield, Mark O.	R*	OR	SEN	$ 4,832
Case, Clifford P.	R*	NJ	SEN	1,983	Hinshaw, Andrew J.	R*	CA	39	1,475
Chafee, John H.	R	RI	SEN	2,030	McCloskey, Paul	R*	CA	17	3,269
Domenici, Pete V.	R	NM	SEN	2,079	Percy, Charles H.	R*	IL	SEN	3,808
							TOTAL		$22,190

504

MPS. A. N. SPENCER CARRIZOZO, NEW MEXICO HOUSEWIFE

Domenici, Pete V.	R	NM	SEN	$25,000
			TOTAL	$25,000

W. CLEMENT STONE CHICAGO, ILLINOIS PRES COMBINED INSURANCE CO

Boggs,J. Caleb	R*	DE	SEN	$ 3,000	Percy, Charles H	R*	IL	SEN	$ 2,500
Griffin, Robert	R*	MI	SEN	2,500	Randolph,Jennings	D*	WV	SEN	2,412
Hirsch,Robert W	R	SD	SEN	500	Steelman, Alan	R	TX	05	500
Hoellen,John	R	IL	11	1,000	Young, Samuel	R	IL	10	10,400
McClure,James A.	R	ID	SEN	500					
							TOTAL		$23,312

MRS.MARGARET TOWSLEY ANN ARBOR,MICHIGAN HOUSEWIFE

505

Esch, Marvin L.	R*	MI	02	3,000	Griffin, Robert	R*	MI	SEN	$ 21,000
							TOTAL		$24,000

DE WITT & LILA ACHESON WALLACE PLEASANTVILLE, NEW YORK CHM READERS DIGEST & HOUSEWIFE

Bartlett, Dewey	R	OK	SEN	$ 2,000	Hibbard,Henry	R	MI	SEN	$ 2,000
Blount, Winton	R	AL	SEN	2,000	Hirsch,Robert W.	R	SD	SEN	1,000
Chafee,John H.	R	RI	SEN	2,000	McClure,James A.	R	ID	SEN	1,900
Domenici,Pete	R	NM	SEN	2,000	Nunn, Louis B.	R	KY	SEN	1,400

Goldwater, B. Jr.	R*	CA 27	1,000	
Griffin,Robert	R*	MI SEN	1,000	
Hansen,Philip	R	MN SEN	500	
Helms,Jesse I.	R	NC SEN	2,000	
Spence,Floyd D.	R*	SC 02	500	
Thompson,Fletcher	R	GA SEN	1,000	
Tower,John G.	R*	TX SEN	2,880	
		TOTAL		$23,180

[00156]

LAWRENCE WEINBERG,BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA, EXECUTIVE, LARWIN, CORP.**

Abourezk, James	D	SD SEN	$2,892	
Anderson, Glenn	D*	CA 35	1,900	
Biden, James R.	D	DE SEN	2,000	
Boas, Roger	D	CA 06	850	
Brooks, Jack	D*	TX 09	2,900	
Burton, Philip	D*	CA 05	2,000	
Camacho, Julian	D	CA 12	850	
Corman, James C.	D*	CA 22	2,000	
Daniels, Jack	D	NM SEN	2,900	
Danielson, George	D*	CA 29	2,000	
Davis, William E.	D	ID SEN	2,000	
Dellums, Ronald	D*	CA 07	2,000	
Edmondson, Ed	D	OK SEN	2,900	
Johnson, Harold	D*	CA 02	2,000	
Kelley, Frank J.	D	MI SEN	2,900	
Leggett, Robert	D*	CA 04	2,000	
Lemucchi,Timothy	D	CA 36	2,900	
McFall, John J.	D*	CA 15	2,000	
Metcalf, Lee	D*	MT SEN	2,900	
Mondale, Walter	D*	MN SEN	2,900	
Morse, Wayne L.	D	OR SEN	5,800	
Moss, John E.	D*	CA 03	2,000	
Nunn, Sam	D	GA SEN	2,900	
Randolph,Jennings	D*	WV SEN	2,900	
Rees, Thomas	D*	CA 26	2,000	

506

Edwards, Don	D*	CA 09	2,000	
Galifianakis,Nick	D	NC SEN	2,000	
Hanna, Richard	D*	CA 34	2,000	
Hawkins, Augustus	D*	CA 21	2,000	
Holifield, Chet	D*	CA 19	2,000	
Huddleston,Walter	D	KY SEN	2,000	
Roybal, Edward	D*	CA 30	2,000	
Sanders, Barefoot	D	TX SEN	2,000	
Sisk, B.F.	D*	CA 16	1,900	
Spaekman, John	D*	AL SEN	2,900	
Spong, William	D*	VA SEN	1,995	
VanDeerlin,Lionel	D*	CA 41	1,900	
Waldie, Jerome	D*	CA 14	2,000	
		TOTAL		87,087

** Contributors Goldblum, Saft and Weinberg channeled their donations through the National Committee for the Re-Election of a Democratic Congress (Known as the Strauss Committee). They were allowed to designate (earmark the funds) the candidates receiving their money. It is not known if all the earmarked money actually went to each of the designated candidates.

507

119. Analysis to Contributors to the Finance Committee to Re-Elect the President

Attached is the Common Cause identification of contributors disclosed in the report filed September 28, 1973 by the Finance Committee to Re-elect the President. The report was ordered filed by Judge Joseph Waddy of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in Connection with a Common Cause lawsuit.

Pages 2-7 Identification of contributors $40,000 and above.

Pages 8-17 Identification of contributors $10,000 - $39,000.

Pages 18 - 24 Identification of contributors $5,000 - $9,999. The dollar amount set forth for each listed donor in the *right corner* represents the amount given for the total reporting period (January 1, 1971 - April 6, 1972). The figure in the *left corner* represents the amount given prior to March 10, 1972, and already made public. If there is no figure in the left hand corner, then the amount in the right corner is the total given during the previously secret period of March 10, 1971, to April 6, 1972.

The letter "c" next to the amount means it was a cash contribution. A husband and wife's joint gift has been listed under the husband's occupation.

CONTRIBUTIONS ABOVE $40,000

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Robert Allen Pres Gulf Resources & Chemical Corp Houston, TX STATE CHM, FIN CRP	$100,000 c (returned)
	Walter Annenberg Ambassador to England Philadelphia Publisher	$250,000
	Employees of American Airlines New York, NY	*$75,000 c ($55,000 returned)
	*$20,000 from George Spater former Chm Bd.	

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	William Burden Gen Ptnr Wm A.M. Burden & Co (Investment Bnkg) New York, NY	$97,895
$60,000	Citizens for Good Government LTV Corp Employees (Aerospace) Dallas, TX	$60,000
	Henry Crown Chm Bd Henry Crown & Co Chicago, IL	$50,819 ($25,000 c)

	Theodore Ashley Chm & Pres Warner Bros (Records, motion pictures) New York, NY	$137,056		Nathan Cummings Hon Chm Consolidated Foods Corp Chm Bd Ass. Products Inc (Mnfr & Wholesale Food) New York, NY	$44,356
	Orin Atkins Chm Bd Ashland Oil Ashland, KY	$100,000 c (returned to Ashland oil)		Theodore Cummings Beverly Hills, CA	$46,407
$2,000	Loren Berry Chm L.M. Berry & Co. (Tel directory advertising) Dayton, OH	$102,000		Brownlee Currey, Jr Sr VP Equitable Securities Morton (Investment Bnkg) New York, NY	$74,195
$25,000	Elmer Bobst Hon Chm Warner-Lambert Pharmaceutical Co Morris Plains, NJ	$100,000		Shelby Davis Ambassador to Switzerland former Ptnr, Shelby, McCollum & Davis (Investment bnkg)	$100,000
	Employees of Braniff Airways Dallas, TX *$5,000 from H. L. Lawrence *$5,000 from C. E. Acker	*$50,000	$1,000	Christian de Guigne Chm Bd Stauffer Chemicals Co (Industrial chemicals & fertilizers) San Francisco, CA	$107,830
	E. W. Brown, Jr Chm Bd Gulfport Shipbldg Co Port Arthur, TX	$150,000	$28,000	Vincent de Roulet Ambassador to Jamaica	$50,000 ($22,000 c)

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Frederick L Ehrman Chm Exec Comm Lehman Corp (Investment Bkng) New York, NY	$ 69,357	$25,000	Albert F. Gordon VP Albert H. Gordon CHM Kidder Peabody & Co (Stockbrokers) New York, NY	$99,873

	Harvey Firestone, Jr Retired Chmn & Pres Firestone Tire & Rubber Akron, OH	$48,712		Kingdon Gould, Jr Ambassador to the Netherlands Ptnr, PMI, Inc (Parking lots) Washington, D.C.	$100,000
$100,000	Leonard Firestone Chm Bd Firestone Tire & Rubber Co of California Los Angeles, CA	$100,000	$170,000	Raymond R. Guest (former ambassador to Ireland) Horse breeder King George, VA	$200,000
	Raymond Firestone Chm Bd Firestone Tire & Rubber Co Akron, Oh	$63,441		Employees of Gulf Oil Corp Pittsburgh, PA	$100,000 c (returned)
	Max M. Fisher Chm Bd Fisher-New Center Co (Real Estate) Detroit, MI CO-CHM, FIN CRP	$125,000		Walter A. Haas Hon Chm Levi Strauss & Co San Francisco, CA	$48,557
				Armand Hammer Chm & CEO Occidental Petroleum Los Angeles, CA	$46,000 c

	Mrs. Edsel B. Ford Grosse Pointe, MI	$50,000		Bob Hope Entertainer North Hollywood, CA	$50,000
	Henry Ford II Chm Bd Ford Motor Co	$49,776		Howard Hughes 1700 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W. Washington, D.C.	$50,000
	Thomas Ford Investments Self-employed New York, NY	$50,000	$100,000	John P. Humes Ambassador to Ireland	$100,000
$50,000	J. Paul Getty Pres Getty Oil Los Angeles, CA	$75,000	$50,000	John N. Irwin II Ambassador to France	$50,000
	Employees of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Akron, OH	$40,000 c (returned)		Marion W. Isbell Chm & CEO Ramada Inns (Motels, restaurants) Phoenix, AZ	$41,241

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71/TO 3/10/72		1/1/71/TO 4/6/72
	Thomas V Jones Chm Bd & Pres Northrop Corp Aerospace) LA,CA	$40,000		J. Willard Marriott Sr. Chm Bd Marriott Corp Washington, D.C.	$ 67,069
$27,117	Willard W. Keith Pres Marsh, McLennan- Cosgrove & Co (Insurance brokers) Los Angeles, CA	$56,606	$48,505	Anthony D. Marshall Ambassador to Trinidad	$48,505
	Peter Kiewit Pres Peter Kiewit & Sons (General contractors & heavy construction) Omaha, NB	$100,912		Jack Massey Chm Bd Hospital Corp of America (Owns and runs hospitals) Nashville, TN	$250,000
				Mrs. Abby R. (Rockefeller) Mauze New York, NY	$50,000

S14

	Robert Kleberg Pres King Ranch Inc (Ranch, crude petro- leum & nat gas) Kingsville, TX	$100,000		Lewis Maytag Chm & CEO National Airlines Miami, FL	$50,000
	Lester B. Knight Chm Lester B. Knight & Assoc (Construction & engineering Chicago, IL	$50,000		H.W. McCullum Chm Exec Comm amerada Hess Corp (Crude oil & nat gas) New York, NY	$42,000
	William Lasdon Chm & CEO Warner-Lambert Pharmaceurical CO NY,NY	$40,000		William McKnight Hon Chm Bd Minnesota, Mining & Mnfg. Co (3 M Company) St. Paul, MN	$100,191
$46,122	Gustave Levy Gen Ptnr Goldman Sach & Co (Investment Bnkg) CO-CHM, FIN CRP	$70,442		Andre Meyer Gen Ptnr Lazard Freres Co Investments) New York, NY	$90,000

S15

	Lawrence Lewis, Jr Chm Bd Flagler System (Hotels) Richmond, VA ST CHM, FIN CRP	$90,000		Joseph Meyerhoff Chm Bd Monumental Properties Inc (Real estate dev - shopping center) Baltimore, MD	$104,848
	Nathan Lipson Pres Venture Industries Inc (Mnfr carpets) Atlanta, GA	$98,120		Otto Miller & Assoc Chm Standard Oil of CA San Francisco, CA	$50,000
				Seymour Milstein Bldg material mfgr Scarsdale, NY	$65,000

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

516

[00162]

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Roger Milliken Pres Deering Milliken Inc (Textiles) Spartanburg, SC	$84,000	$70,572	Thomas Pappas Pres, Pappas Co Inc (Food & liquor importers) Chm, Esso Pappas Refinery, Greece Boston MA CO-CHM, FIN CRP	$100,673
	John Moran Chm Bd Hycel Inc (Mfr med chemicals & laboratory equip) Houston, TX	$101,008	$80,000	Mrs. Chas. S. Payson (Owner, New York Mets) New York, NY	$80,000
$255,000	John A. Mulcahy Pres Quigley Co (Steel furnace subsidiary of Pfizer Inc - pharmaceuticals Bronxville, NY	$573,559		George Pfleger Dir Emerson Electric Co Newport Beach, CA	$47,088
				Employees of Phillips Petroleum Bartlesville, OK	$100,000 C (returned)

517

	Clint and John Murchison Oil Producers, Owners, Dallas Cowboys Dallas, TX	$50,000 c	$51,000	Mrs. Lillian Phipps (Widow of investment banker) New York, NY CO-CHM, FIN CRP	$51,000
$100,000	John M. Olin Hon Chm Olin Corp (Indust & agric chemicals) New York, NY	$100,000		Louis F. Polk, Jr former VP General Mills, Inc New York, NY REG CHM, FIN CRP	$49,211
	Spencer T. Olin Dir & former 1st VP Olin Industries (Indus & agric chemicals) St. Louis, MO	$94,513	$50,000	Valere Blaire Potter (Ties with oil industry through Justin Potter Foundation, a major stockholder in Mobil Oil) Nashville, TN	$50,000
	Florenz Ourisman Florenz R. Investment Co (Real estate dev) Washington, D.C.	$150,000		Meshulam Riklis Chm Bd & Pres Rapid American Corp (Mfr men's clothing, family products) New York, NY	$50,000

518

	David Packard Chm Bd Hewlett-Packard Co (Mfr electronics defense contractor) Palo Alto, CA	$51,000		John D. Rockefeller Hon Chm Rockefeller Foundation New York, NY	$50,000

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

519

[00163]

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/72 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Laurence Rockefeller Chm Rockefeller Brothers Fund Inc New York, NY	$50,000		Howard Stamper Chm Bd Banquet Foods Corp St. Louis, MO	$46,807
	Nelson Rockefeller Governor, New York State	$50,000	$117,822	Jules Stein Chm Bd Music Corp of America (Phonograph records) Los Angeles, CA	$117,822

John W. Rollins $245,024
Pres
Rollins International Inc
(Conglomerate - TV broadcasting, trucking)
Greenville, DE
CO-CHM, FIN CRP

John H. Safer $250,000
(Real estate, apartment builder, shopping center owner)
Bethesda, MD

Henry Salvatori $99,415
Chm & Pres
Grant Oil Tool Co
(Oilwell speciality drilling tools)
Los Angeles, CA

$800,000 Richard Scaife $1,000,000
(Heir to Mellon fortune - Gulf Oil & Mellon banking)
Pittsburgh, PA

Saul Steinberg $250,000
Chm & CEO
Leasco Corp
(Computer services)
Great Neck, NY

George Steinbrenner $75,000
Chm & CEO
American Shipbuilding Co
Cleveland, OH

James E. Stewart $50,000 c
Chm Bd
Lone Star Industries
Greenwich, CT

$1,000,000 W. Clement Stone $2,000,000
Chm & CEO
Combined Insurance Co. of America
Evanston, IL

$66,102 Taft Schreiber $66,102
VP
Music Corp of America
(Phonograph records)
Los Angeles, CA
CO-CHM, FIN CRP

C. Arnholt Smith $200,000
Chm. Bd (returned)
Westgate Calif. Corp.
(Food, trans, real estate & insurance)
Chm & Pres U.S. Nat'l Bank
San Diego, CA

$244,000 Kent H. Smith $244,000
ret Chm
Lubrizol
(Mfr chemicals & additives for lubricants & fuels)
Gates Mill, OH

J. Fife Symington $50,000
Lutherville, MD

$187,500 TAPE $187,500
(Associated Milk Producers Inc)
San Antonio, TX

Daniel J. Terra $250,000
Chm & Pres
Lawter Chemicals
(Printing, synthetic resins)
Kenilworth, IL

Charles Thornton $48,116
Chm Bd
Litton Industries
Los Angeles, CA

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Robert L. Vesco Chm & CEO International Controls Corp Fairfield, NJ	$200,000 c (returned)			
$100,000	Elisha Walker, Jr (Investments heir) New York, NY	$100,000			
$100,000	Dewitt Wallace (Founder, Reader's Digest) Mt. Kisco, NY	$100,000			
	J.L. Warner (Motion picture executive) Los Angeles, CA	$100,000			
	Gene M. Washburn Corona del Mar, CA	$50,000			

522

$300,000	Arthur K. Watson (former Ambassador to France & former Chm Bd, IBM World Trade Corp) New Canaan, CT	$300,000			
	Ray A. Watt Chm Bd Watt Industries Los Angeles, CA	$86,568			
	Cornelius V. Whitney Pres Whitney Ind New York, NY	$300,000 ($250,000 returned)			
	Jack Wrather Founder & Chm Wrather Corp (Disneyland Hotel, Lassie, Vacationland & Muzak Div) Beverly Hills, CA	$84,060			
	Toddie Wynne Pres American Liberty Oil Co. Dallas, TX	$50,000			

523

CONTRIBUTIONS BETWEEN $10,000 AND $39,999

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
$15,000	ADEPT (Mid-America Dairymen Inc) Springfield, MO	$15,000
	Ralph M. Adler Executive Amerada Hess Corp New York, NY	$39,000
	Herbert Allen Ptnr, Allen & Co (Investment Banking) New York, NY	$15,000
	James Allen VP & Asst to Pres Northrop Corp (Aerospace) Los Angeles, CA	$20,000
$100	Mrs. Gordon (Maxy Pope) Alles San Marino, CA	$15,100
	Dwayne Andreas Chm Exec Comm Archer-Daniels Midland Co (Soybeans) Minneapolis, MN	$25,000 c
$1000	Isaac Arnold Dir Cullen Center Bank & Trust Houston, TX	$11,000
** (Isaac Arnold, Jr. - see pg. 9)		
$500	Roy Ash Director Office of Management & Budget (OMB) former Pres, Litton Ind Washington, DC	$20,500

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Perry Bass Chm Bd Sid Richardson Carbon Gas Co (Butane, propane & nat gas) Fort Worth, TX	$20,000 c
	Walter R. Beardsley Chm Miles Laboratories, Inc (Pharmaceuticals) Elkhart, In	$10,000
$9,000	MacDonald Beckett Pres Welton Becket & Assoc (Architects) Los Angeles, CA	$12,000
	Leo Berger Pres Avon Steamship Co Lake Success, NY	$10,000 c
	George F. Berlinger Welfare Inspector General New York State	$25,000
	Philip Block, Jr Chm Exec Comm Inland Steel Co Chicago, IL	$10,000
$5,000	Joseph Bogdanovich Pres & Dir Star-Kist Foods Inc San Pedro, CA	$30,000
	Beverly A. Bogert Investor Self-employed New York, NY	$10,000

Bruce Baker $18,000
Jericho, NY

Alexander Barket $25,000
Chm & Pres
Civic Plaza Nat'l Bank
Kansas City, MO

David Bradshaw $15,000
Attorney
Bradshaw, Speranza,
Ververka & Brumlick
Chicago, IL

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

[00166]

526

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Albert Broccoli Producer James Bond spy movies London, England	$10,000		Neil Carothers III Washington, DC	$30,075
	Margaret M. Brock Exec V Chm Republican Nat'l Finance Comm Los Angeles, CA	$21,000	$25,000	Henry Catto, Jr Ambassador to El Salvador	$25,000

Isaac Arnold, Jr $10,000
Dir
Cullen Center Bank
& Trust
Houston, TX

August Busch III $13,317
Exec VP
Anheuser-Busch
(Beer)
St. Louis, MO

John Christo, Jr $33,400 c
Chm
Bay Nat'l Bank & Trust
Panama City, Fl

Hugh Close $24,000
Chm
Spring Mills Inc
(Textiles)
Fort Mill, SC

Donald Comer, Jr $15,000
Pres & CEO
Avondale Mills
(Textiles)
Sylacauga, AL

Peter Constas $10,000 c
Exec
Avon Steamship Co
Lake Success, NY

Charles Cook $12,000
Owner
Cook Bros
Industry, CA

527

J.D. Callender Exec VP & Tr Amerada Hess Corp (Crude oil & refining) New York, NY	$12,000				
B. Gerald Cantor Chm & Pres Cantor Fitzgerald & Co (Investment Bnkg) Beverly Hills, CA	$10,000				
Edward Carlson Pres United Airlines Prospect, IL	$23,452				
Oliver C. Carmichael, Jr. Chm Bd, Assoc Corp of N A (Subsid of Gulf & Western Industries) South Bend, IN CO-CHM, FIN CRP	$19,166	$1000			
			G. Bradford Cook Former Chm Securities & Exchange Comm (SEC), Wash.,D.C.	$10,000	
			Mrs. Juanita Cooper Greenville, SC	$15,000	
			Harry Cullen (Oil operator) Dir Cullen Center Nat'l Bank Houston, TX	$10,000	
			Roy Cullen Oil operator Houston, TX	$11,000	

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72	1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72	1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
Justin Dart Chm & Pres Dart Industries (Pharmaceuticals, hospital supplies, plastics & glass) Los Angeles, CA	$25,993	John Dorrance Chm Bd Campbell Soup Co Camden, NJ	$34,800
J. Morton Davis Gen Ptnr D.H. Blair & Co (investments) New York, NY	$10,000	Jack A. Drown Drown News Agency Westminster, CA	$25,000
Donald Dayton Dir Dayton-Hudson Corp Minneapolis, MN ST CHM, FIN CRP	$10,640	Reynolds duPont Consultant Wilmington, DE	$36,000
		C.W. Durham Chm Bd & Pres Great Plains Natl Gas Co (Nat gas distr) Omaha, NB	$10,000

	Henry Dekker Spartanburg, SC	$10,000		James A. Elkins Attorney Vinson, Elkins, Searls, & Connally Houston, TX	$15,000 c
	Frederick Dent former Pres & Tr Mayfair Mills (Textiles) Arcadia, SC SECRETARY OF COMMERCE	$10,500		Joseph T. Farland former Ambassador to Iran	$10,000
	C. Douglas Dillon former Secretary of Treas (Investment Bnkg) New York, NY	$24,000		Al Fay VP Bel Oil Corp Lake Charles, LA Member Republican Nat'l Comm from Texas	$30,242
	John C. Donnell Pres Marathon Oil (oil & nat gas) Findlay, OH	$14,000	$500	William H.G.Fitzgerald Stockbroker Hornblower, Weeks, Hemphill, Noyes Washington, DC STATE CHM, FIN CRP	$25,500
$2,000	Gaylord Donnelley Chm Bd PR Donnelley & Sons Co (Printing & Lithography) Libertyville, IL	$25,883			

	Margaret H. Donner Colorado Springs, CO	$24,000
	Robert Donner, Jr Administrator, trust funds Woodman Land Co Colorado Springs, CO	$25,000

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

[00168]

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
$10,000	Helen Clay Frick (Daughter, Henry Frick) Pittsburgh, Pa	$10,000		R.V. Hansberger Pres Boise Cascade Corp (Forest products) Boise, ID	$20,000
$10,000	Richard L. Gelb Pres Bristol-Myers (Pharmaceuticals & cosmetics) New York, NY	$10,000			

Sumner Gerard $38,867
USAID, Tunisia

David Grainger $25,000
Chm Bd
W.W. Grainger Inc
(Mnfr electrical pumbs
& supplies)
Chicago, IL

W.W. Grainger $25,000
Dir
W.W. Grainger Inc
Chicago, IL

Cecil Green $24,692
Dir
Texas Instruments
(Electronics)
Dallas, TX

Edward H. Hamm $24,000
Chm & VP
Northland Co
(Insurance)
St. Paul, MN

Jake Hamon $25,000 c
Oil & gas producer
Dallas, TX

Marco Hellman $25,000
V Chm & Cir
Dean Witter & Co
(Securities)
San Francisco, CA

Harry Helmsley $10,000
New York, NY

James Hemphill $25,000
Gen Ptnr Goldman
Sachs & Co.(Invest.
Bnkg) Chicago,IL

Maurice Greenberg $15,000
Pres & CEO
American International
Group Inc (Insurance sub.
& reinsurance)
New York, NY

Max Greenfield $24,000
Attorney
Greenfield & Stein
New York, NY

Patrick E. Haggerty $13,798
CEO
Texas Instruments
(Electronics)
Dallas, TX

Leon Hess $10,000
Chm & CEO
Amerada Hess Corp
(Crude oil & refinery)
New York, NY

William Hewlett $18,000
Pres & CEO
Hewlett-Packard Co
(Electronics)
Palo Alto, CA

Joseph Hirshhorn $25,000 c
Chm Bd
Callahan Mining Corp
(Silver & copper)
New York, NY

Mrs. Frances E. Hoffman
$15,847
(Wife of Founder)
Hoffman Electronics Corp
Los Angeles, CA

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Wayne Hoffman Chm Flying Tiger Corp (Charter airline) Los Angeles, CA	$30,000 c
	John Howland Pr & CEO Westpoint Pepperell Inc (Fabrics) Westpoint, GA	$10,000
	Hadlai Hull Attorney Asst Secretary of the Army	$15,451
	Jaquelin Hume Chm Bd American Potato Co	$10,000
	Chm Bd, Basic Vegetable Products (Mnfr dehydrated vegetables) San Francisco, CA	
$1000	Arthur E. Johnson Retired Chm Midwest OIl Co Dir United Banks of Colorado Denever, CO	$13,000
	Howard Johnson Pres & CEO Howard Johnson Co (Restrarant chain) New York, NY	$15,000
	J.E. Jonsson Hon Chm Texas Instruments (Electronics) Dallas, TX	$26,013

534

535

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Howard Keck Pres Superior Oil Co (Crude oil & nat gas) Houston, TX	$10,000
	Robert Kogod Pres Charles E. Smith (Real Estate) Washington, DC	$10,000
	Cal Kovens Pres Kovens Construction Co Miami, FL	$30,000 c
	Philip Kramer Pres Amerada Hess Corp (Crude oil & refining) New York, NY	$12,000
	Theodore Law Chm Falcon Seaboard Inc (Holding co, oil exploration) Houston, TX	$14,000
	Cyrus Lawrence Cyrus J. Lawrence & Sons (Stockbrokers) New York, NY	$12,000
	Lawrence Leeds White Plains, NY	$18,000
	Samuel LeFrak Pres LeFrak Organization (Real estate) New York, NY	$24,910

Earle M. Jorgensen $25,000
Chm & CEO
Earle M. Jorgensen Co
(Seel & aluminum prod)
Los Angeles, CA

Saul Kahan $18,000
Accountant
Nathan Tannenbaum & Co
New York, NY

Wm C Liedtke Jr Pres $23,348
Pennzoil United, Inc
(Oil,gas explor,mining)
Houston, TX
REG CHM, FIN CRP

F. W. Lloyd $15,000
Sen VP
Northrop Corp
(Aerospace)
Los Angeles, CA

536

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

[00170]

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
$10,000	Henrietta J. Louis Chicago, IL	$10,000	$22,000	Jeremiah Milbank, Jr Chm Bd Commercial Solvents (Mfr chemicals, industrial gasses, pharmaceuticals & explosives) New York, NY CO CHM, FIN CRP	$22,000
$5,000	John J. Louis, Jr Chicago, IL	$22,034			
	E.A.G. Manton Chm & Dir American International Group Inc (Insurnace, subs. reinsurance) New York, NY	$10,000	$22,000	Jeremiah Milbank, Sr (Retired, father of Jeremiah Jr) Greenwich, CT	$22,000
	Eugene McDermott Dir Texas Instruments (Electronics) Dallas, TX	$26,013		Paul Miller Chm Bd Pacific Lighting Corp. (Natural Gas) Los Angeles, CA	$25,000

537

$1,000	James S. McDonnell Chm McDonnell-Douglas Corp (Aerospace) St. Louis, MO	$21,670		Employees of Minnesota Mining & Mfg-3M St. Paul, MN	$30,000c (returned)
	E.S. McKissick, Jr Pres Alice Mnfg Co (Textiles) Easley, SC	$15,000		Charles Mitchell & Associates Former Chm Bd Cities Service New York, NY	$28,000 c
	Frank McMahon Racing stables owner Palm Beach, FL	$10,000		Walter Montgomery Chm & CEO Spartan Mills (Textiles) Spartanburg, SC	$20,000
$32,000	Paul Mellon (Member Mellon family - Gulf Oil, Mellon Bank, etc) Upperville, VA	$32,000		Robert Mosbacher (Oil operator) Houston, TX Chm, Republican National Finance Committee	$24,675
	Spyros Metaxa Athens, Greece	$10,000			

538

	Richard Meyer Pres Anheuser-Busch (Beer) St. Louis, MO	$13,316		Hugh Neuhaus Houston, TX	$14,575

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

539

[00171]

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Arthur C. Nielsen Chm Bd A.C. Nielsen Co (Ratings/Market research) Chicago, IL	$30,000		W. Crocker Pew (Stockholder, Sun Oil Co) Philadelphia, PA	$30,000
	Ramon Nolan Queson City Philippines	$25,000		Robert Pike Sec Crocker Nat'l Bnk San Francisco, CA	$10,000

Robert Paliafito $30,111
Pres
National Health Enterprises
Milwaukee, WI

Potter Palmer $10,071
Chm
Globe Trotter
Communications
Chicago, IL

Tudie Patti $25,000
V Chm Bd
Civic Plaza Nat'l Bank
Kansas City, MO

Edwin Pauley $35,000
Chm Bd
Pauley Petroleum Inc
Los Angeles, CA

Jeno Paulucci $25,000
Chm Bd
Cornelius Co
(Beverage vending & dispensing equipment)
Duluth, MN

Thomas Pike $24,457
V Chm
Fluor Corp
(Heavy construction)
Los Angeles, CA

Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro
Attorneys $10,000
San Francisco, CA

Jules Posner $18,000
Great Neck, NY

James R. Price $18,175
Chm Bd
National Homes Corp
(Mfrd & industrialized homes)
Lafayette, IN

William Wood Prince $25,000
Pres
F.H. Prince & Co
Chicago, IL

$12,000

Miss Amelia Peabody $10,000
Boston, MA

Edward Petrillo $10,000
Pres & Tr
Yonkers Contracting Co Inc
Yonkers, NY

Miss Ethel Pew $30,000
(Stockholder, Sun Oil Co
Philadelphia, PA

Robert J. Quinn $12,000
Gen Ptnr Salomon Bros
(invest Bnkg)
New York, NY

1972 DC Republican $20,000
Dinner
Washington, DC

Robert Reynolds $25,000
Pres & Dir
Golden West Broadcasters
(California Angels)
Los Angeles, CA

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Julian H. Robertson, Jr VP Kidder Peabody (Investments) New York, NY	$26,582		James Self Pres Greenwood Mills (Textiles) Greenwood, SC	$18,000
	Willard Robertson Pres Willard E. Robertson (Ret & whls autos) New Orleans, LA St CHM, FIN CRP	$10,000		Mrs. Evelyn Sharp (real estate, self employed) New York, NY	$16,377
542			$15,000	William E. Simon Gen Ptnr Salomon Bros. (investment banking) New York, NY	$15,000
$39,000	Peter B. Ruffin Galbreath-Ruffin Corp (Real estate - speciality offices and office bldgs) New York, NY	$39,000			
	Adolph Rust A.H. Rust & Co New York, NY	$20,000		Robert Six Pres Continental Airlines Los Angeles, CA	$15,000
	Kerby Saunders Inc (Mech contrac) New York, NY	$10,000		Charles Smith Chm Bd Charles E. Smith Co (real estate & construction) Washington, DC	$15,000
	D.J. Schaffer Great Neck, NY	$18,000		Gloria Smith Greenwood SC	$18,000
$15,000	John Schiff Ptnr Kuhn Loeb & Co. (Investment Banking) New York, NY	$15,000		Robert Smith Pres Charles E. Smith Co (Real estate & construction) Washington, DC	$10,000
543					
	John Schuler Chm Anderson Electric Co Leeds, AL STATE CHM, FIN CRP	$17,018		William Smith Dir, Pacific Lighting Corp, Pacific Mutual Life & Crocker National Corp San Marino, CA	$10,000
$1000	Joseph Segel Chm, Pr & CEO The Franklin Mint (Coins, metals, ingots) Franklin Center, PA	$10,000	$20,000 $10,000	SPACE (Dairymen, Inc) Louisville, KY	$30,000

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	Mrs. William N. Spenser, Jr Mill Valley, CA	$24,000		Robert Vance Pres & Dr Clinton Mills (Textiles) Clinton, SC	$12,000
	Whitney Stone Chm Bd & Dir Stone & Webster Inc (Management consultants) New York, NY	$21,000	$15,000	Nicholas Varvinoganis (oil refining & shipping) Athens, Greece	$15,000
$18,000	Vernon Stouffer Chm Litton Industries Food Services Group Stouffer Foods Corp Lakewood, OH	$18,000		Ben Voth Ben Voth Investments Dir, Gulf Insurance Co Tulsa, OK ST CHM, FIN CRP	$24,048
				George Wallace Fitchburg, MA	$10,000

544

	Leif Sverdrup Chm & CEO Sverdrup & Parcel Associates (consulting eng. & architects) St. Louis, MO	$19,334	$5,000	Lloyd B. Waring VP Kidder, Peabody & Co Boston, MA REG CHM, FIN CRP	$10,000
	Employees of Texas Eastern Transmission Corp (Production refining & transportation of gas & oil) Houston, TX	$30,000 c		Irving Warshauer Accountant Nathan Tannenbaum & Co New York, NY	$18,000
	Employees of Time Oil Los Angeles, CA	$16,000		Employees of Wells Fargo (Bank) Good Govt Comm San Francisco, CA	$20,000
	Mrs. Louise Timken Canton, OH	$12,000		George H. Weyerhaeuser Pres & CEO Weyerhaeuser Co (Forest products) Tacoma, WA	$25,000
	W.R. Timken Chm Bd Timken Co (Mnfr roller bearings) Canton, OH	$14,000			

545

Wheelock Whitney $12,466
(Investments, self-employed)
Minneapolis, MN

Mrs. John Truyens $10,315
Los Angeles, CA

Oscar S. Wyatt, Jr $25,512
Chm Bd
Coastal States
Gas Producing Co
Corpus Christi, TX

Holmes Tuttle $25,000
Chm Bd
Tuttle Enterprises
(auto sales & leasing)
Los Angeles, CA

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

[00174]

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	
James D. Willson Sen VP Northrop Corp (Aerospace) Los Angeles, CA	$20,000		
$25,000	David K. Wilson Pres Cherokee Equity Corp Nashville, TN REG CHM, FIN CRP	$25,000	
$25,000	Anne Potter Wilson Nashville, TN	$25,000	

SOURCE: COMMON CAUSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE MONITORING PROJECT

[00175]

CONTRIBUTIONS BETWEEN $5,000 and $9,999

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71/ TO 4/6/72	1/1/71/ TO 3/10/72		1/1/71/ TO 4/6/72
	Collie Anderson Clinton, SC	$ 5,000		George Bunker Chmn Martin Marietta (Aerospace) New York, NY	$ 7,500
	Herbert Barness Dir Union Fidelity Corp Philadelphia,PA	$ 6,000			

Leigh Battson $ 7,500
Retired Director
Music Corp of
America
Beverly Hills, CA

Robert Beattie $ 5,324
VP Dart Industries
(Chemicals, houseware,
drug stores)
Los Angeles, CA

Karl Bendetsen $ 7,500
Chm Champion
Intl Corp (Forest
Products)
New York, NY

Robert Bendheim $7,500 c
Chm Bd
M. Lowenstein & Sons
Inc. (textiles)
New York, NY

August Busch, Jr. $ 9,749
Chm & CEO
Anheuser - Busch Inc
St. Louis, MO

Laurence Buser $ 5,000c
Pres Amer Export
Lines Inc
New York, NY

Morton Carpenter $ 6,000
Wilmington, DE

W. Sam Carpenter III $ 6,000
Dir E.I.duPont
Wilmington, DE
ST CHM, FIN CRP

Edward Carter $ 9,913
Chm Broadway -
Hale Stores Inc
Los Angeles, CA

B. F. Biaggini $ 5,000
Pres & CEO
Southern Pacific Co
San Francisco, CA

William Bristol III $ 5,000
Sr VP Bristol -
Myers Co
(Pharmaceuticals -
cosmetics)
New York, NY

George R. Brown $9,443
Dir, Halliburton Inc
(oil field svcs)
Chm Bd, Brown & Root
(Engineers & Construction)
Houston, TX

Hugh Chatham $ 5,000
Pres
Chatham Mfng Co
(Textiles)
Elkin, NC

Mrs. Claire Chennault 5,000
VP Flying Tiger Lines
Wash.,D.C.
CO-CHM FIN CRP

E. Cohen $ 5,000
VP & Tr
Giant Food Inc
(Wholesale & retail
grocers)
Landover, MD

SOURCE: Common Cause Campaign Finance Monitoring Project

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 to 3/10/72		1/1/71/ TO 4/6/72
	N.H. Cohen Chm Giant Food Inc Landover, MD	$ 5,000		Roy Disney VP Walt Disney Productions North Hollywood, CA	$ 5,876
	George Cook Chm & CEO Bankers Life Insurance Co of Nebraska Lincoln,NB RNFC ST CHM NB	$ 7,192		Timothy Doheny Self-employed Beverly Hills,CA	$ 5,000
	Lammot Copeland Retired Chm E.I. duPont Co Wilmington,DE	$ 5,000		William Doheny Oil industry exec Beverly Hills, CA	$ 5,000
				Elliott Donnelley V Chm RR Donnelley & Sons Co (Commercial printers) Chicago, IL	$ 5,000

	Alec P. Courtelis Courtelis Construction Co (Real estate development) Miami, FL	$ 5,000		Donald Douglas Sr VP McDonnell-Douglas Corp (Aerospace) St. Louis, MO	$ 7,827
	Joseph Cullman III Chm & CEO Philip Morris Inc (Cigarettes,textiles, toiletries,etc.) New York,NY	5,000		Roger Drackett Chm Drackett Co (Subs Bristol-Myers) (Household cleaners) Cincinnati, OH	$ 5,000
	Kenneth Dahlberg Chm,Dahlberg Electric Inc Minneapolis, MN REG CHM, FIN CRP	$ 7,000		J. Howard Edgerton Chmn, California Savings & Loan Los Angeles, CA Member, Republican Nat'l Committee	$ 5,000
	Corwin Denny Los Angeles, CA	$ 5,000			

William Denton VP Southern Pacific Co (Railroad) San Francisco, CA	$ 5,000		
Russell DeYoung Chm Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co Akron, OH	$ 5,000	George Edmonds Dir E. I. duPont (Chemicals) Wilmington, DE	$ 5,000
		Julius Epstein New York, NY	$ 9,000

SOURCE: Common Cause Campaign Finance Monitoring Project

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72	1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72	1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
Walter Erman V Chm Luria Steel & Trading Corp (Dealer scrap iron & steel) Chicago, IL	$ 5,000	Irwin Gleich Accountant Nathan Tannenbaum & Co New York, NY	$ 9,000
Stanley Frank Chm & Tr Carolina By- Products Co Inc (Animal fats & fat derived chemicals Greensboro, NC	$ 5,000	Edward Goldberger M. Lowenstein & Sons Inc. (textiles) New York, NY	$ 7,500c
Herbert J. Frensley Pres & Dir of	$ 6,760 (2000 c)	Richard Goldman Pres Richard N. Gold- man Co San Francisco, Ca	$ 5,230
		Fitzhugh Green Assoc Admin Intl Activities	$ 8,281

various subsid of
Haliburton Co
(oilfield svc) and
Brown & Root Constr.Inc.
Houston, TX

J. Burton Frierson $ 9,000 c
Chm Dixie Yarns Inc.
(textiles)
Chattanooga, TN

Alan Furth $ 5,000
VP
Southern Pacific Co
San Francisco, CA

Bruce Gelb $ 5,000
Sr VP
Bristol-Myers Co
New York, NY

$ 5,000 Lawrence Gelb $ 5,000
Chm Clairol Inc
(subs Bristol-Meyers)
(cosmetics & pharmaceuticals)
New York, NY

Environmental Protection
Agency
Washington, DC

Crawford $ 5,000
Greenwalt
Dir
E.I. duPont
Wilmington,DE

$ 5,000 Alan Gressel $ 5,000
Cleveland, OH

Peter Haas $ 5,000
Pres
Levi Strauss & Co
(Apparel)
San Francisco, CA

Walter Haas Jr $ 5,000
Chm & CEO Levi Strauss
& Co (Apparel)
San Francisco, CA

Richard Harman $ 5,000
New York, NY

John Gillin $ 5,000
Dallas, TX

Herbert Hazeltine $ 5,283
Attorney
Adams, Duque &
Hazeltine
Los Angeles, CA

SOURCE: Common Cause Campaign Finance Monitoring Project

[00178]

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	George Heery Heery & Heery (Architects) Atlanta, GA	$ 5,000		Jay Kislak Miami, FL	$ 5,000
	F. Warren Hellman Dir Lehman Bros (Investments) New York, NY Member, Republican National Comm	$ 5,152		Sidney Lamon Leon Templesman & Co (Imptrs industrial diamonds) New York, NY	$ 5,000c
				William H. Lane Pres. Riviana Foods Inc (rice products) Houston, TX	$ 9,000 (8,000c)

Harold Helm Chm Exec Comm Chemical Bank & Trust Co New York, NY CO-CHM, FIN CRP	$ 6,300		Jacob Lehrman VP & Sec Giant Foods Inc Landover, MD	$ 5,000
John Hilson Gen Ptnr Wertheim & Co (Investment Bnkg) New York, NY	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	Herbert Louis Dir Combined Communications Corp (outdoor advtsg, radio, TV & films) Chicago, IL	$ 5,000
John Hobart Chm & Tr LaSalle St Press Co (Commercial printers) Chicago, IL	$ 6,451	$ 5,000	Michael Louis Chicago, IL	$ 5,000
			William Lund Los Angeles, CA	$ 5,096
David Ingalls V Chm Taft Broadcasting Cleveland, OH	$ 6,000	$ 8,000	William Lyles, Jr. VP Lyles, Bissett, Carlisle & Wolff (architects & planners) Columbia, SC	$ 8,000

556

Paul Judy Pres & CEO A.G. Becker & Co (Underwriters & securities dealers) Chicago, IL	$ 7,500	$ 5,000	Andrew Machata Pres Blackhawk Heating & Plumbing Co Delray Beach, FL	$ 5,000
		$ 6,000	Connie S. Manniatty Gen Ptnr Salomon Bros. (investment banking) New York, NY	$ 6,000
W.S. Kilroy Oil operator Houston, TX	$ 6,000			

557

SOURCE: Common Cause Campaign Finance Monitoring Project

[00179]

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72	1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
Albert Martin Los Angeles, CA	$ 5,008		Louis Nippert Attorney Cincinnati, OH	$ 8,000

Mrs. Tom May $ 5,000
Wife of VP
May Dept Stores
Los Angeles, CA

Gavin McBain $ 6,000
Chm Bd
Bristol-Myers
(Pharmaceuticals)
New York, NY

Glen McDaniel $ 5,100
Litton Industries
Los Angeles, CA

Robert McLain $ 7,500
Los Angeles, CA

Denman McNear $ 5,000
VP
Southern Pacific Co
(Railroad)
San Francisco, CA

$6,000 James O'Brien $ 6,000
Gen Ptnr
Salomon Bros
(Investment banking)
New York, NY

John O'Hara $ 5,000
Ptnr
Price Waterhouse & Co
(Accountants)
Philadelphia, PA

William Pereira $ 5,500
Pres William L. Pereira
Associates
(Architecture-engineering)
Los Angeles, CA

Franklin Pollack $ 5,611
V Chm
Dart Industries Inc
(Drug chain, pharmaceuticals)
pharmaceuticals)
Los Angeles, CA

Clarence Michalis $ 5,000
VP Bristol-Myers
(Pharmaceuticals)
New York, NY

Nathan Milikowsky $ 5,000
Owner Jordan
International Corp
(Importers-Exporters)
New Haven CT

Ronald Miller $ 6,188
VP Walt Disney
Productions
Burbank, CA

$9,000 Vincent Murphy $ 9,000
Gen Ptnr
Salomon Bros
(Investment banking)
New York, NY

Frank Newman $ 6,000
Retired
Boca Raton, FL

Robert Price $ 6,000
Lafayette, IN

Thomas Reed $ 5,000
Pres Quaker Hill
Development Corp
San Rafael, CA

Donald Regan $ 5,000
Merrill Lynch
(Security underwriters)
New York, NY

Walter Reisinger $ 6,657
VP Anheuser-Busch Inc
(Beer)
St. Louis, MO

Stanley Resor $ 5,000
Attorney
Debevoise, Plimpton,
Lyons & Gates
Former Secy of the Army
New York, NY

SOURCE: Common Cause Campaign Finance Monitoring Project

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
$ 6,000	Richard Rosenthal Gen Ptnr Salomon Bros (Investment banking) New York, NY	$ 6,000		Mark Shepherd, Jr. Pres & CEO Texas Instruments (Electronics) Dallas, TX	$ 9,913
$ 9,000	William Salomon Gen Ptnr Salomon Bros (Investment Bnkg) New York, NY	$ 9,000	$ 5,000	Edward Sullivan Insurance Agent Self-employed Mt. Kisco, NY	$ 5,000
	Santa Fe Employees Civic Trust 80 Good Government Fund (Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad) Chicago, IL	$ 6,000		Maurice Templesman Leon Templesman & Co (Importers-industrial diamonds) New York, NY	$ 5,000 c

560

M.M. Schmidt Balboa Island, CA	$ 5,000	
Frederic Schwartz V Chm Bd Bristol-Myers (Pharmaceuticals) New York, NY	$ 5,000	
W.T. Sesnon Los Angeles, CA	$ 5,000	
Hugh Sharp Dir E.I. duPont (Chemicals) Wilmington, DE	$5,000	
Forest Shumway Pres Signal Companies Inc (Aerospace equipment, oil & gas production) Los Angeles, CA	$ 5,000	
Mrs. Agnes Shumway Los Angeles, CA	$ 5,000	
Sam Thomas Ruston, LA		$ 5,000
William R. Timken, Jr VP Timken Co (Mnfr roller bearings) Canton, OH		$ 8,000
W.J. Timken Dir Timken Co (Mnfr roller bearings) Canton, OH		$ 5,000
Robert Tishman Pres Tishman Realty & Construction (Builders, real estate operators) New York, NY		$ 5,000
$ 8,000	Robert Turner Retired Palm Beach, FL	$ 8,000
	Leigh Tuvin Yonkers, NY	$ 9,000

561

$ 6,000	Charles J. Simon Gen Ptnr Salomon Bros (Investmen' banking) New York, NY	$ 6,000		Union Carbide Pol.Cont. (Chemicals) Washington, D.C.	6,400
	John Simpson Chicago, Il	$ 6,000		Adalbert Von Gontard Dir Anheuser-Busch Inc (Beer) St. Louis, MO	$ 6,657

SOURCE: Common Cause Campaign Finance Monitoring Project

562

[00181]

1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72	1/1/71 TO 3/10/72		1/1/71 TO 4/6/72
	William Walkup Chm Bd & Ex VP Signal Companies Inc (Aerospace systems, oil & gas products) Los Angeles, CA	$ 5,000		R. D. Ziegler VP Dart Industries Inc (Drug chain, pharmaceuticals) Los Angeles, CA	$5,786

	Hal Wallis Hollywood producer Universal City, CA	$ 7,500			
	Porter Washington Beverly Hills, CA	$ 5,000			
	Harry Wetzel Chm & Pres Garrett Corp (Aerospace Sub. of Signal Cos) Los Angeles, CA	$ 5,000			
	F. K. Weyerhaeuser former Chm Bd Weyerhaeuser Co (Forest products) St Paul, MN	$ 5,000			
	David Williams, Jr Chm Exec Comm Williams Companies (Pipeline operation, contractor) Tulsa, OK	$ 9,944			

563

Ralph Wilson Dir Dart Industries Inc (Drug chain, pharmaceuticals) Los Angeles, CA	$ 5,456
Robert Winthrop Hon Chm Wood, Struthers & Winthrop Inc (Brokers) New York, NY	$ 8,000

SOURCE: Common Cause Campaign Finance Monitoring Project

B. COLE FINDINGS

1. Roland Cole began active work on his dissertation in early 1972, having taken a reading course in the fall of 1971 in preparation therefor. He studied the broad areas of campaigns including considerable material on election laws, theories of voting, and other related topics.

In researching and writing his dissertation, Cole particularly wanted to complement the complete and documented studies on contributions that he understood Common Cause would produce.

Cole relied on three basic sources of data in researching and writing his dissertation: literature in the field that would provide an indication of what candidates might spend money on, why they would so spend it, and how they had spent it in past campaigns; the official reports of campaign spending in all 67 major party campaigns for the United States Senate in 1972 and the coding thereof for computer analyses; and interviews with personnel in twelve of the 1972 campaigns and with observers and other individuals associated with the field

of campaign finance.

In the process of writing his dissertation, Cole wrote letter to over 200 political consultants, received about 100 replies, and continued correspondence with many of those who replied about what they did in political campaigns. Also, in preparation for his dissertation, Cole read over 450 separate sources.

Although Cole employed the assistance of other persons in preparation for the dissertation, for such things as coding, Cole at one time or another looked at every single line of code in the process itself and every single expenditure report summary page.

Cole interviewed the campaign manager or someone of comparable stature, the campaign treasurers in most, and one candidate in the 12 campaigns. The 12 campaigns in which he conducted these interviews were: the Illinois Pucinski and Percy campaigns; the Iowa Clark and Miller campaigns; the Michigan Kelly and Griffin campaigns; the Rhode Island Pell and Chafee campaigns, and the Texas Sanders and Tower campaigns. Tr. 9. Cole also interveiwed personnel involved in the Biden (D-Del.) Senatorial campaign, and the campaign manager of the Brooke (R-Mass.) campaign.

[000184]

In selecting the twelve particular campaigns for interviews with key personnel, Cole sought a wide range of campaigns: (1) campaigns which exceeded the expenditure limits and those which did not; (2) campaigns which won and those which lost; (3) campaigns which resulted in close elections and campaigns which resulted in victories by substantial margins; (4) campaigns in different regions of the country; (5) campaigns which appeared to have different kinds of strategies; (6) campaigns whose candidates had differing personalities; (7) campaigns in states with different geographical and social patterns; and (8) campaigns in states of different sizes.

Other factors entering the selection of campaigns for interviews with key personnel were (1) different ranges of

the amounts of money available to the candidates; (2) state population size; (3) the media structure of the states (the material for which was obtained from standard reference works); (4) whether or not gubernatorial races were being run concurrently with the senatorial races studied; (5) the amount of information the states did or did not provide to campaigns; (6) the extent to which campaigns in states

[000185]

felt the need to conduct vigorous election day activities; (7) population distribution; (8) differences in candidates' capacities as refelected in the expenditure reports; (9) the nature of the internal information flows within campaign organizations; (10) the extent to which campaigns paid for outside media consultants; (11) relative reliance upon media spending; (12) the generation of free media coverage; (13) the allocations of campaign moneys among various campaign activities; (14) prior offices held by candidates; (15) the extent to which services were provided by campaign consultants and the prior affiliations in campaign activities of the consultants themselves; (16) incumbency; and (17) party affiliations.

Many of these variables interrelate. For example, incumbents and challengers have different kinds of staffs, different backgrounds, and different campaign structures. The political culture, population and geography of a state, and the diversity within it tend to be associated with different kinds of campaign structure.

The distribution of voter registration lists and electoral information by the State of Massachusetts,

[000186]

one of the most generous in the country in terms of State-provided services, did not appear to make a major difference in that State's Senate race. The distribution of such material appeared to have more impact on local races in the State.

2. The Cole Affidavit filed by plaintiffs presents statistical data from the 1972 Senate elections. The statistical data were extracted from the reports filed pursuant to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. This Act took effect on April 7, 1972 and the reports covered from April 7, 1972 to February 1, 1973. The calculations and conclusions are based on the following assumptions and definitions:

(a) "General Election Spending" includes total expenditures, as defined below, reported to the Secretary of the Senate as made subsequent to the date of nomination (unless denominated as a primary expense), plus total expenditures reported to the Secretary of the Senate as made prior to the date of nomination (unless denominated as a primary expense) where the candidate was

[000187]

unopposed in the primary or where the candidate had no serious opposition in the primary election (*i.e.*, where the candidate's opponent(s) received less than 10% of the primary vote).

(b) Primary spending includes total expenditures, as defined below, reported to the Secretary of the Senate as made prior to the date of

the primary (or primary runoff, unless such spending is considered general election spending as defined in the preceding paragraph).

(c) The definitions of general election spending and primary spending in the preceding paragraphs are based on the further assumption that it is possible to segregate expenditure figures for such elections with reasonable accuracy, but not with certainty, from the reports filed pursuant to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

(d) Expenditures are defined as total campaign disbursements including funds which

[000188]

have been used to repay loans made to the candidate or his political committees. The use of the proceeds of those loans is considered a campaign expenditure and the repayment of that loan is considered a separate and additional campaign expenditure. (*See* Exhibit 1 to Cole Deposition at Vol. II, pp. 298-299 for a tabulation of loans and loan repayments by 1972 Senate candidates.)

(e) Expenditures are further defined to include transfers to organizations outside the campaign.

(f) Expenditures are further defined to exclude unpaid debts. Specifically, debts incurred for purposes of the campaign, but not yet paid, are not considered campaign expenditures.

(g) Transfers between committees exclusively

supporting a candidate or between such committees and the candidate are not treated as either contributions or expenditures.

[000189]

3. The following chart shows the results of Cole's statistical analysis of the reports filed by the 67 major Senate candidates that he reviewed:

[000190]

Table 6. General Election Spending by Campaign

State*	Candidate**	Percent of Vote	General Election Spending: ¢ per Adult	$ per Vote	Total Spent ($)
AL	John H. Sparkman (DI)	65.3	0.26	0.97	633,119
	Winton M. Blount (RC)	34.7	0.31	1.99	691,732
AK	W. Eugene Guess (DC)	22.7	0.25	2.17	47,277
	Ted Stevens (RI)	77.3	1.04	2.63	195,241
AR	John J. McClellan (DI)	60.9	0.17	0.56	219,019
	Wayne Babbitt (RC)	39.1	0.06	0.29	72,449
CO	Floyd K. Haskell (DC)	50.3	0.13	0.41	187,865
	Gordon Allott (RI)	49.7	0.21	0.71	316,432
DE	Joseph R. Biden, Jr. (DC)	50.7	0.62	1.92	222,299
	J. Caleb Boggs (RI)	49.3	0.47	1.49	167,745
GA	Sam Nunn (DN)	54.0	0.14	0.65	412,706
	Fletcher Thompson (RN)	46.0	0.22	1.24	673,759
ID	William E. (Bud) Davis (DN)	46.5	0.37	1.24	174,699
	James A. McClure (RN)	53.5	0.59	1.71	277,355
IL	Peter C. Futinski (LC)	37.5	0.05	0.20	336,870
	Charles H. Percy (RI)	62.5	0.18	0.47	1,339,044
LA	Richard C. Clark (DC)	55.5	0.13	0.37	243,285
	Jack Miller (RI)	44.5	0.16	0.56	296,288
KS	Arch O. Tetzlaff (DC)	24.4	0.02	0.13	26,751
	James B Pearson (RI)	75.6	0.06	0.15	92,770
KY	Walter Dee Huddleston (DN)	51.7	0.34	1.40	742,566
	Louie B. Nunn (RN)	48.3	0.29	1.28	634,978
LA	J. Bennett Johnston,Jr. (DN)	56.7	0.16	0.62	369,714
	Ben C. Toledano (RN)	19.6	0.05	0.56	115,208
	John J. McKeithen***(N)	23.7	0.18	1.67	417,130
ME	William D. Hathaway (DC)	53.2	0.27	0.78	175,602
	Margaret Chase Smith (RI)	46.8	0.01	0.03	6,689
MA	John J. Droney (DC)	35.3	0.02	0.07	61,669
	Edward W. Brooke (RI)	64.7	0.09	0.24	357,091
MI	Frank J. Kelley (DC)	47.0	0.10	0.35	551,229
	Robert P. Griffin (RI)	53.0	0.24	0.79	1,399,220
MN	Walter F. Mondale (DI)	56.9	0.14	0.36	356,164
	Philip Hansen (RC)	43.1	0.12	0.41	304,633

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State*	Candidate**	Percent of Vote	General Election Spending: $ per Adult	$ per Vote	Total Spent ($)
MS	James O. Eastland (DI)	60.0	0.19	0.71	267,469
	Gil Carmichael (RC)	40.0	0.11	0.60	149,951
MT	Lee Metcalf (DI)	52.0	0.28	0.98	126,905
	Henry S. Hibbard (RC)	48.0	0.56	1.67	252,099
NB	Terry Carpenter (DC)	46.8	0.03	0.13	34,515
	Carl T. Curtis (RI)	53.2	0.25	0.83	259,475
NH	Thomas J. McIntyre (DI)	56.9	0.17	0.48	87,9[illegible]
	Wesley Powell (RC)	43.1	0.13	0.65	91,136
NJ	Paul J. Krebs (DC)	35.6	0.01	0.04	39,955
	Clifford P. Case (RI)	64.4	0.03	0.07	130,677
NM	Jack Daniels (DN)	46.0	0.64	2.31	401,093
	Pete V. Domenici (RN)	54.0	0.73	2.26	460,761
NC	Nick Galifianakis (DN)	46.0	0.08	0.39	262,971
	Jesse Helms (RN)	54.0	0.19	0.81	641,434
OK	Ed Edmondson (DN)	48.1	0.18	0.68	325,65[illegible]
	Dewey Bartlett (RN)	51.9	0.36	1.24	643,151
OR	Wayne Morse (DC)	46.2	0.13	0.45	192,885
	Mark O. Hatfield (RI)	53.8	0.17	0.50	246,245
RI	Claiborne deB. Pell (DI)	54.0	0.80	2.39	530,072
	John H. Chafee (RC)	46.0	0.69	2.42	457,359
SC	Eugene N. Zeigler (DC)	36.7	0.07	0.47	112,438
	Strom Thurmond (RI)	63.3	0.37	1.48	616,295
SD	James A. Abourezk (DN)	57.0	0.84	2.08	363,511
	Robert W. Hirsch (RN)	43.0	0.60	1.96	258,452
TN	Ray Blanton (DC)	38.1	0.07	0.41	182,250
	Howard H. Baker, Jr. (RI)	61.9	0.31	1.15	827,113
TX	Harold Barefoot Sanders (DC)	45.3	0.06	0.29	439,150
	John Goodwin Tower (RI)	54.7	0.34	1.37	2,505,873
VA	William B. Spong (DI)	47.3	0.13	0.64	414,733
	William L. Scott (RC)	52.7	0.21	0.92	660,251
WV	Jennings Randolph (DI)	66.4	0.13	0.33	159,875
	Louise Leonard (RC)	33.6	0.04	0.19	47,773
WY	Mike Vinich (DC)	28.7	0.05	0.26	10,507
	Clifford P. Hansen (RI)	71.3	0.88	1.91	193,852

* This study uses the official U.S. Postal Service abbreviations for each state. Note 7 in Volume II of this study contains the complete code.

** D = Democrat; R = Republican; I = Incumbent; C = Challenger; N = Nonincumbent (i.e., candidates for seat unoccupied at time of election)

*** Independent

4. Challengers won three 1972 races where they outspent incumbents (Hathaway defeated Smith in Maine; Biden defeated Boggs in Delaware, and Scott defeated Spong in Virginia). Challengers lost three 1972 races where they outspent incumbents (Powell lost to McIntyre in New Hampshire; Blount lost to Sparkman in Alabama, and Hibbard lost to Metcalf in Montana). Challengers won two 1972 Senate races where they spent less than the incumbents (Clark defeated Miller in Iowa; and Haskell defeated Allott in Colorado); challengers lost 17 1972 Senate races where they spent less than the incumbents.

5. In two 1972 Senate races where challengers defeated incumbents, the challenger spent more than the greater of 18.4¢ per adult of $220,000 (12¢ per adult or $150,000 plus 20% of these figures for expenses relating to fundraising, plus the greater of 2¢ per adult or $20,000 allocable to national party spending, plus the greater of 2¢ per adult or $20,000 allocable to state party spending): Biden defeated Boggs in Delaware, and Scott defeated Spong in Virginia. In three 1972 Senate races where challengers defeated incumbents the challenger spent less than these amounts: Haskell defeated Allott in Colorado; Clark defeated Miller in Iowa, and Hathaway defeated Smith in Maine.

6. In three of the five races for Senate in 1972 where challengers spent more than 18.4¢ per adult or $220,000 the challengers lost: Blount was defeated by Sparkman

in Alabama; Hibbard was defeated by Metcalf in Montana, and Chafee was defeated by Pell in Rhode Island.

The results stated in paragraph 5 would be identical if the cut-off were 14.4¢ per adult or $180,000 (12¢ or $150,000 plus 20%) instead of 18.4¢ or $220,000 upon which the conclusions in paragraph 5 and 6 are based.

7. The five challengers or their campaign managers that Cole interviewed stated that they felt they needed a certain amount of money to run their campaigns. They also stated that the amount of money they wished to spend was unrelated to the amount available to their incumbent opponent. However, none of these people who Cole interviewed knew what the figure was that they thought they needed to raise. Cole believes that these individuals were not able to set a figure on the amount they thought was necessary for their campaigns because the amount of money that a challenger needs to run his campaign is affected by innumerable factors.

[000193]

8. In order to determine whether or not a candidate had gained widespread name recognition, Cole relied on discussions with political observers based on what the observers learned from polls and other information obtained before and after the elections.

9. Name recognition was closely examined in the twelve campaigns in which key personnel were interviewed plus the Biden campaign, the campaign of Brooke's opponent and the Tetzlaff campaign in Kansas.

10. The manager of the Pucinski Illinois campaign felt that the candidate was fairly well-known in his Chicago district and somewhat well-known in other districts in

Chicago, but not known at all "down state." The candidate's name recognition was greater after the campaign than before. Key personnel in the campaign believed they did not have enough money to make contact through radio and newspaper ads.

11. Key personnel in the Pucinski campaign stated that some small unions or smaller locals of large unions in Illinois did not contribute because they believed they were unable to handle the FECA's disclosure and accounting requirements. These personnel also stated that many of the traditionally Democratic unions in

[000194]

Illinois were committed to Percy from the outset of the campaign.

12. In the 1972 Michigan Senate race, candidate Kelley, in the view of his key campaign personnel and other observers, had high name recognition at the beginning of the campaign and a very high name recognition at its end. They felt they did not have enough money to counteract the importance of the busing issue with the issue of the economy. The Kelley campaign did not raise more than the greater of 14.4 cents per adult or $180,000.

13. In the Sanders-Tower 1972 Texas Senate race, Sanders' campaign personnel felt that at the outset of his campaign Sanders was fairly well-known in northern Texas but lacked that degree of recognition elsewhere in the State. At the end of his campaign, they felt that Sanders was on a "rising curve" and that they had increased his name recognition, but not as much as they desired.

14. In the 1972 Senate campaigns for which Cole conducted interviews, Cole discovered that a number of people

who had worked in the campaigns had, during their term of service with an incumbent Senator on the State

[000195]

payroll, developed expertise on the issues, with regard to the State, and with regard to media outlets in the State. A number of individuals who had developed expertise moved from the Senate payroll onto the campaign payroll. Some candidates used in their campaigns lists developed through the use of the frank, in order to mail non-franked campaign material and to set up the campaign. All the incumbents Cole spoke to or heard about used the contacts built up over their term of office when they campaigned.

15. Cole discussed the supervision of volunteers with campaign managers involved in the campaigns for which Cole conducted interviews. All of them believed that while volunteers could occasionally supervise others, and while they could work without the supervision of a paid staff, this resulted in a level of efficiency markedly lower than when a paid staff supervised volunteers.

16. Both the Percy and the Tower campaigns used computers to produce contributor reports. The Tower campaign also used computers for expenditure reports. The Tower campaign spent at least $30,000 to comply with the disclosure requirements.

[000196]

17. The Huddleston campaign began with a $50,000 loan from the State Party and a $200,000 bank loan.

18. In Senator Pell's campaign for the Senate in 1972, twenty-one cents was spent for each voter contacted by telephone.

19. Thirty-three of the major Senate campaigns in 1972 spent in excess of the greater of 14.4 cents per adult or $180,000. Of these campaigns, 15 were incumbents, 2 of whom lost; 13 were campaigns of those in races in which no incumbent competed, 6 of whom lost; 5 were challengers, 3 of whom lost.

20. If all spending in excess of the greater of 14.4 cents per adult or $180,000 were eliminated from the spending in the 1972 Senate races, spending would have been $16.8 million or 2/3rds of the actual total.

21. The 67 major party Senate campaigns in 1972 spent a total of $2.3 million for mailing.

22. In the 1972 Senate campaigns, television advertisements cost more than $6 per minute for each 1,000 voters they reached.

23. The 1972 campaigns for the Senate spent

[000197]

$1,000,000 for telephone calls plus an estimated $100,000 for telephone banks listed under non-broadcast media.

24. In 1972, the 67 major party Senate campaigns spent $24.5 million in the general election.

25. In 1972, the 10 challengers who defeated incumbents in general elections for the House of Representatives spent an average of $125,521. The defeated incumbents spent an average of $86,075.

26. In the 1972 U.S. Senate campaigns, challengers won three out of the four races where they outspent the incumbent by more than 10 percentage points, one of the four races where they spent within 10 percentage points of the incumbent, and only one of the 17 races where

the incumbent outspent them by more than 10 percentage points.

27. In 1972, no U.S. Senate candidate who spent more than 32¢ per adult received less than 43 percent of the votes cast.

28. Five challengers to incumbents won in 1972 campaigns for the U.S. Senate. Three of these outspent their incumbent opponents. The basic categories in which challenger winners spent more relatively than their

[000198]

incumbent opponents were staff, events and material.

29. Of the 3 challengers mentioned in the preceding paragraph, 2 spent more than 14.4 cents per adult or $180,000 and more than 18.4 cents per adult or $220,000.

30. Some 1972 Senate campaigns conducted activities designed to obtain the news coverage they might otherwise have purchased. The amount of time such activities consumed varied from state to state.

31. The Griffin campaign for the U.S. Senate in 1972 found its mail drives for small contributions were recovering much more than the cost of the solicitation letters, but little more than that cost plus the cost of the letters, telephone calls and other efforts necessary to gather the required information about those who gave money.

The Griffin campaign made much more extensive use of direct mail than others. In addition to using the standard computer list that had been built up over the years, as did other incumbents, Griffin tried a series of mailings into neighborhoods he had not previously solicited.

[000199]

Incumbents other than Griffin made extensive use of direct mail solicitations to raise small contributions and recovered much more than all the costs incurred in that effort, including any costs incurred for letters, telephone calls and other efforts to gather the information required by the disclosure statute then in effect.

32. In the 1972 campaigns for the Senate, campaigns which spent more than the greater of 14.4 cents per adult or $180,000 received 27.26 percent of their total contributions in gifts of less than $100. Campaigns which spent less than the greater of 14.4 cents per adult or $180,000 received 19.74 percent of their total contributions in gifts of less than $100.

33. In the 1972 campaigns for the Senate, campaigns which spent the greater of 14.4 cents per adult or $180,000 received many more small contributions than did campaigns that spent below those amounts.

34. In the 1972 U.S. Senate campaigns, money was employed by many candidates to poll the electorate and to research issues perceived as problems by the electorate.

35. In 1972, candidates for the U.S. Senate employed money to conduct voting registration drives and canvasses to get out voters.

[000200]

36. Those 1972 U.S. Senate campaigns that recruited and used volunteers spent money to recruit, supervise and supply them.

37. Campaigns also spend money for telephone calls and letters used to solicit contributions.

38. A professional poll of the electorate in the U.S. Senate campaigns in 1972 cost between $3,000 and $25,000.

39. In the 1972 U.S. Senate races, volunteers who joined the campaign were supervised by paid staff. The campaigns hired a total of about 2500 people.

40. In the 1972 senatorial election campaigns, one campaign phone call or letter cost approximately 20 cents.

41. Practically every person with whom Cole spoke about the costs of raising campaign money said that the cost per contribution of obtaining large contributions is less than small contributions both in terms of money actually expended and, more often, in terms of the total time and effort of the staff. This was the view of practically every person with whom Cole spoke

[000201]

about costs of raising money.

42. Using 1967 as a base year (index equals 100), the consumer price index equalled 124.3 in 1972 and 147.7 in 1974. Correcting 1974 limits to 1972 dollars makes 14.4 cents per adult or $180,000 equal to in excess of the greater of 12.2 cents per adult or $153,000.

43. The 5 challengers who defeated incumbents spent in excess of the greater of 12.2 cents per adult or $153,000. Five challengers who lost to incumbents spent in excess of the greater of 12.2 cents per adult or $153,000.

44. The relation of campaign expenditures for campaigns for nomination to campaign expenditures for the general election varies widely from one area of the country to another, from one candidate to another.

45. The concept of marginal utility, as usually used by economists, refers to the idea that an increment of some thing, often money, differs in value to the individual or group receiving it depending upon how much of that thing, often money, the individual or group already has. That is to say, if you have a very little bit of money, for almost all purposes, slightly more

[000202]

would be much more valuable to you than would the same amount be to a person having a lot of money.

46. The marginal utility of campaign money is not identical from state to state or from congressional district to congressional district.

47. The Consumer Price Index is based on the prices of a wide variety of items of which campaign items represent small subsets. Furthermore, campaign items tend to be those, historically, whose prices increase faster than the inflation rate, in particular, items such as wages and other payments for personal services, and advertising costs of various sorts.

48. Small contributions are generally raised through mailings by the use of lists obtained by purchase, loan, or donation, of people who the campaign thinks might be willing to contribute to the candidate or the campaign for some reason. A list of that sort may be broken down into types of contributors and different letters may be sent to the different types. Or, perhaps, one general letter will be sent to all the types. On the basis of the response to the initial mailing or series of mailings the list will be culled to eliminate therefrom those people as to whom resolicitation would

not be fruitful. Furthermore, if names of other potential contributors are requested from this solicitation, such names might be added to the list. In these ways the list is expanded and contracted in different directions for future resolicitations.

49. A very high percentage of campaigns that seek to raise small contributions rely significantly on direct mail expenditures.

50. Costs of fundraising, particularly direct mail or telephone solicitation of a large number of people for small contributions, tends to average around 40 percent of the money raised.

51. Incidental out-of-pocket expenses connected with volunteer work and independent expenditures of other kinds which aid a candidate were not included in Cole's figures for expenditures in Senate races in 1972. Tr. 395. Such expenditures occurred in 1972.

52. In Cole's research for his dissertation, he was told of independent expenditures in campaigns for incidental cots which were in some cases over $500.

53. In attempting to draw inferences from 1972 election figures as to the effect of the FECA Amendments, inflation should be taken into account.

54. The ease or difficulty with which campaign money can be raised is one of several factors affecting the decision of individuals to run for office.

55. The availability of money for a campaign is a

factor in the decision of whether or not a person seeks public office.

56. One mailing to a household cannot be assumed fully to inform the voting members of that household of all campaign issues. In many cases, the voting members of the household will have independent interests and relate to different issues. For example, a direct mailing to a husband may not address issues of most concern to his wife.

57. A reduction in political campaign activity will decrease the amount of information voters receive directly from candidates.

58. Candidates cannot rely on the media to get to the voters through news reports the information that the candidates would like to get to the voters.

59. A reduction in news generating campaign activity will tend to reduce the amount of news coverage

of a campaign.

60. Incumbents have a better opportunity than challengers to engage in activities which generate news coverage which does not cost money.

61. It is possible that significant amounts of expenditures in Senate races in 1972 were made prior to April 7, 1972.

62. Items which might be major costs in a campaign would include wages, television, mailings, newspaper advertising, consulting fees, computer processing, and salaries for technical services such as accountants and lawyers.

Campaigns differ in the percentage of resources allocated to various purposes. Most of these costs, however, involve personal services or effort, both of which have risen in cost faster than in the Consumer Price Index.

63. Direct mail specialists indicate that the rate of return on mailing lists of incumbent senators was in many cases greater than the rate of return on lists the specialists could devise for challengers.

64. Numerous factors affect the level of spending in any campaign, including resources available

[000206]

to candidates, population, media structure in election districts, campaigns for other offices occurring at the same time, state services, campaign structure, information flow, media contracts, campaign strategy, paid and free media, background of candidate, political popularity of candidate, use of campaign consultants, and incumbency.

65. The amounts each campaign expended for particular campaign activities such as mailings, phone use, televison, etc., varied widely.

66. In 1972, 14 of the Senatorial candidates who exceeded 14.4¢ per adult or $180,000 in the general election were incumbents; 13 were non-incumbents (*i.e.*, there was no incumbent in the race); and 5 were challengers to incumbents.

67. The fact that a candidate in 1972 spent more than his opponent and/or more than the limit which the 1974 laws would impose was only one of a number of factors which had an effect on the outcome of the election.

68. Many challengers do not raise private

[000207]

contributions to the extent incumbents do, and are thereby severely disadvantaged.

69. Challengers vary widely in the nature and extent of the resources with which they commence a potential campaign, such as political appeal or name - recognition.

70. Cole does not know how many full-time volunteers worked in any of the 1972 Senatorial elections.

71. Many campaigns felt that disclosure did not lower the amount they could raise.

72. More research is needed before the complete answer to the relationship between money and votes is known.

73. Much more research is needed before one can know the extent of the relationship between votes and expenditures, how much it varies from campaign to campaign, and whether there is any causal relationship between the two factors. These reservations apply to the following statement: "Not only does the higher spending campaign win most of the time, its share of the votes cast is closely correlated with the share of the

[000208]

dollars spent."

74. Many factors other than and including the level of spending may be important in determining the outcome of all elections.

75. In many races in which an incumbent is running against a challenger who does not present opposition

neither candidate spends very much money.

76. No one connected with the 14 campaigns Cole studied most closely told Cole that he knew of a potential contributor who did not contribute because he feared disclosure would lead to reprisals against him other than in connection with intra-family disputes.

77. One of the factors determining how much a candidate can raise is the voters' perception of whether he can wage a credible campaign.

78. Profitable mailing lists have been developed for candidates who are not incumbents for use in direct mail solicitation efforts.

79. If money is precluded from entering the elective process in the form of campaign contributions, individuals and organizations will find other ways to use

[000209]

it in that process.

80. In 1972, many campaigns were able to raise substantial sums by asking for small amounts of money by mail or telephone.

[000210]

C. ADDITIONAL AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. Attachment A to the Answers to Plaintiffs' Interrogatories filed by intervening defendants Common Cause and John Gardner in this court is hereby adopted and incorporated herein by reference as Exhibit A. Attachment A includes a table of Expenditures for All November 1974 Senate Races, and a table of Expenditures for all November, 1974 House Races.

2. Attachment B to the Answers to Plaintiffs' Interrogatories filed by the intervening defendants Common Cause and John Gardner in this court is hereby adopted and incorporated by reference as Exhibit B. Attachment B includes a table of Expenditures for All November, 1974 Senate Races, and a table of Expenditures for All November, 1974 House Races. "No." on that document refers to the number of contributions in excess of $1,000. "Overage" refers to the total amount of contributions in excess of $1,000.

3. The following is a copy of the summary page of the financial report filed by the 1974 Gary Hart Senate Campaign Committee, Inc., as required by the FECA:

[0002111]

SUMMARY PAGE

Name of Committee [illegible]

REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM Oct. 25, 1974 THRU Dec. 31, 1974

		Column A—This period	Column B—Calendar year to date
SECTION A—RECEIPTS:			
Part 1.	Individual contributions:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 78,278.22	
	b. Unitemized	$ 56,178.94	
	Total individual contributions	$ 134,457.16	$ 308,736.10
Part 2.	Sales and collections:		
	Itemized (use schedule B and as necessary schedule A*)	$ 12,806.20	$ 22,796.66
Part 3.	Loans received:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 1,500.00	
	b. Unitemized	$ none	
	Total loans received	$ 1,500.00	$ 16,473.50
Part 4.	Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 6,088.37	
	b. Unitemized	$ none	
	Total other receipts	$ 6,088.37	$ 6,112.63
Part 5.	Transfers in:		
	Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$ none	$ none
	TOTAL RECEIPTS	$ 135,151.73	$ 355,331.03
SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:			
Part 6.	Communications media expenditures:		
	Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$ 21,579.29	$ 85,687.81
Part 7.	Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ 28,454.36	
	b. Unitemized	$ 850.18	
	Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$ 29,304.54	$ 68,368.81
Part 8.	Loans made:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ none	
	b. Unitemized	$ none	
	Total loans made	$ none	$ none
Part 9.	Non-media and other expenditures: (loan repayment -Sch. C)	8,158.50	
	a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$ 72,303.04	
	b. Unitemized	$ 1,855.31	
	Total other expenditures	$ 82,316.85	$ 195,114.38
Part 10.	Transfers out:		
	Itemize all (use schedule D*)	$ none	$ none
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$ 133,300.73	$ 349,167.00

588

C 00150233

588-A

SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:

Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period	$ 7,636.11
Add total receipts (section A above)	$ 134,151.23
Subtotal	$ 142,337.34
Subtract total expenditures (section B above)	$ 135,366.73
Cash on hand at close of reporting period	$ 6,537.11

SECTION D—DEBTS AND OBLIGATIONS:

Part 11. Debts and obligations owed to the committee (use schedule E*)	$ NONE
Part 12. Debts and obligations owed by the committee (use schedule E*)	$ 14,336.27

*Schedules are to be used only when information is required. (See each Schedule for instructions.) When Regulation is unnecessary for a given Part, the total of any amounts for that Part is to be entered as a "0" sum on the "Unitemized" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report when no amount is being reported.

589

[000212]

SUMMARY PAGE

Name of Committee GARY HART SENATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE, INC.

REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM Oct. 15, 1974 **THRU** Oct. 24, 1974

	Column A—This period	Column B—Calendar year to date
SECTION A—RECEIPTS:		
Part 1. Individual contributions:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 38,261.00	
b. Unitemized	$ 5,475.54	
Total individual contributions	$ 43,736.54	$ 103,979.03

Part 2.	**Sales and collections:**		
	Itemized (use schedule B and as necessary schedule A*)	$none	$
Part 3.	**Loans received:**		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$none	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total loans received	$	$
Part 4.	**Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):**		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$none	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total other receipts	$	$ .31
Part 5.	**Transfers in:**		
	Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$	$
	TOTAL RECEIPTS	$	$
SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:			
Part 6.	**Communications media expenditures:**		
	Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$15,043.52	$64,134.52
Part 7.	**Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:**		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$	$

Part 8.	**Loans made:**		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$none	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total loans made	$none	$none
Part 9.	**Non-media and other expenditures:** Loan repayment, Sch. C	4,300.00	
	a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$20,320.12	
	b. Unitemized	$ 41.21	
	Total other expenditures	$	$
Part 10.	**Transfers out:**		
	Itemize all (use schedule D*)	$none	$none
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$	$
SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:			
	Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period	$11,614.38	
	Add total receipts (section A above)	$	
	Subtotal	$	
	Subtract total expenditures (section B above)	$	
	Cash on hand at close of reporting period	$	
SECTION D—DEBTS AND OBLIGATIONS:			
Part 11.	**Debts and obligations owed *to* the committee (use schedule E*)**	$none	
Part 12.	**Debts and obligations owed *by* the committee (use schedule E*)**	$	

*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. (See each Schedule for instructions.) When itemization is unnecessary for a given Part, the total of any amounts for that Part is to be entered as a lump sum on the "*Unitemized*" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report when no amount is being reported.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[000213]

Name of Committee GARY HART SENATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE, INC.

SUMMARY REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM [illegible] THRU [illegible]

		Column A—This period	Column B—Calendar year to date
SECTION A—RECEIPTS:			
Part 1.	Individual contributions:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 79,274.61	
	b. Unitemized	$ [illegible]	
	Total individual contributions	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]
Part 2.	Sales and collections:		
	Itemized (use schedule B*)	$ none	$ [illegible]
Part 3.	Loans received:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 7,732.50	
	b. Unitemized	$ none	
	Total loans received	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]
Part 4.	Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ none	
	b. Unitemized	$ none	
	Total other receipts	$ none	$ 24.21
Part 5.	Transfers in:		
	Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$ none	$ 1,628.00
	TOTAL RECEIPTS	$ 101,302.61	$ 176,442.71

SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:			
Part 6.	Communications media expenditures:		
	Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]
Part 7.	Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ 12,364.54	
	b. Unitemized	$ 244.37	
	Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]
Part 8.	Loans made:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ none	
	b. Unitemized	$ none	
	Total loans made	$ [illegible]	$ none
Part 9.	Other expenditures: Loan repayment (sch. C)	$3,050.00	
	a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$ 39,222.03	
	b. Unitemized	$ [illegible]	
	Total other expenditures	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]
Part 10.	Transfers out:		
	Itemize all (use schedule D*)	$ none	$ none
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]

SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:	
Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period	$ [illegible]
Add total receipts (section A above)	$ [illegible]
Subtotal	$ [illegible]
Subtract total expenditures (section B above)	$ 93,108.42
Cash on hand at close of reporting period	$ 11,614.38

592

593

SECTION D--DEBTS AND OBLIGATIONS:

Part 11. Debts and obligations owed *to* the committee (use schedule E*) ..... $

Part 12. Debts and obligations owed *by* the committee (use schedule E*) ..... $

*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. (See each Schedule for instructions.) When itemization is required for [illegible] Part, the total of any amount for the Part is to be entered as a lump sum on the "Unitemized" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report when no amount is being reported.

[000214]

Name of Committee GARY HART SENATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE, INC.

SUMMARY REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM August 12, 1[illegible] THRU [illegible]

	Column A—This period	Column B—Calendar year to date
SECTION A—RECEIPTS:		
Part 1. Individual contributions:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 1,915.00	
b. Unitemized	$ 2,191.33	
Total individual contributions	$ [illegible]	$ 56,67[illegible].33
Part 2. Sales and collections:		
Itemized (use schedule B*)	$ 476.40	$ 2,520.46
Part 3. Loans received:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 2,000.00	
b. Unitemized	$ none	
Total loans received	$ [illegible]	$ 7,000.00
Part 4. Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ none	
b. Unitemized	$ none	
Total other receipts	$ none	$ 24.31
Part 6. Transfers in:		
Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$ none	$ 1,623.30
TOTAL RECEIPTS	$ 3,579.72	$ 75,140.16
SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:		
Part 6. Communications media expenditures:		
Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$ 5,725.99	$ 11,827.64
Part 7. Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:		
a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ 390.00	
b. Unitemized	$ 133.09	
Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$ 523.09	$ 18,537.64
Part 8. Loans made:		
a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ none	
b. Unitemized	$ none	
Total loans made	$ none	$ none
Part 9. Other expenditures:		
a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$ 759.93	
b. Unitemized	$ 576.11	
Total other expenditures	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]

Part 10. Transfers out:
Itemize all (use schedule D*) ..... $ [illegible] $ [illegible]

TOTAL EXPENDITURES $ 7,576.12 $ 75,0[illegible]3.07

SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:
Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period ..... $ 2,[illegible]16.57
Add total receipts (section A above) ..... $ [illegible]
Subtotal ..... $ [illegible]
Subtract total expenditures (section B above) ..... $ [illegible]
Cash on hand at close of reporting period ..... $ [illegible]

SECTION D—DEBTS AND OBLIGATIONS:
Part 11. Debts and obligations owed *to* the committee (use schedule E*) ..... $ [illegible]
Part 12. Debts and obligations owed *by* the committee (use schedule E*) ..... $ [illegible]

*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. (See each Schedule for instructions.) When itemization is unnecessary for a given Part, the total of any amounts for that Part is to be entered as a lump sum on the "*Unitemized*" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report when no amount is being reported.

596

[000215]

SUMMARY PAGE

Name of Committee GARY HART SENATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE, INC.

REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM July 9, 1974 THRU August 20, 1974 - AMENDED

	Column A—This period	Column B—Calendar year to date
SECTION A—RECEIPTS:		
Part 1. Individual contributions:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 10,073.50	
b. Unitemized	$ 7,[illegible]25.02	
Total individual contributions	$ 17,[illegible]98.52	$ 61,[illegible]75.67
Part 2. Sales and collections:		
Itemized (use schedule B and as necessary schedule A*)	$ 5,625.00	$ 9,[illegible]13.06
Part 3. Loans received:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 4,220.00	
b. Unitemized	$ none	
Total loans received	$ 4,220.00	$ 4,220.00
Part 4. Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 24.31	
b. Unitemized	$ none	
Total other receipts	$ 24.31	$ 24.31
Part 5. Transfers in:		
Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$ none	$ 1,629.00
TOTAL RECEIPTS	$ 27,068.73	$ 66,[illegible]61.44

597

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

598

SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:

Part 6.	Communications media expenditures: Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$ 5,249.50	$ 8,161.50
Part 7.	Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ 6,740.77	
	b. Unitemized	$ 227.45	
	Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$ 6,968.22	$ 10,012.22
Part 8.	Loans made:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total loans made	$ 0.00	$ 1,000
Part 9.	Non-media and other expenditures:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$ 17,222.01	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total other expenditures	$	$
Part 10.	Transfers out: Itemize all (use schedule D*)	$ 100.00	$
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$	$

SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:

Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period	$ 5,514.57
Add total receipts (section A above)	$
Subtotal	$
Subtract total expenditures (section B above)	$
Cash on hand at close of reporting period	$

SECTION D—DEBTS AND OBLIGATIONS:

Part 11. Debts and obligations owed *to* the committee (use schedule E*)	$ None
Part 12. Debts and obligations owed *by* the committee (use schedule E*)	$

*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. (See col. A Schedule for instructions.) When itemization is necessary for any Part, the total of any amounts for that Part is to be entered on the line numbered and listed on the "Unitemized" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Page. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the summary page where no amount is being reported.

[000216]

599

SUMMARY PAGE

Name of Committee GARY HART SENATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE, INC.

REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM June 28, 1974 THRU July 8, 1974 AMENDED

		Column A—This period	Column B—Calendar year to date
SECTION A—RECEIPTS:			
Part 1.	Individual contributions:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 1,855.00	
	b. Unitemized	$ 1,183.00	
	Total individual contributions	$ 3,038.00	$ 24,376.[illegible]
Part 2.	Sales and collections: Itemized (use schedule B and as necessary schedule A*)	$ 147.00	$ 3,487.16

Part 3.	Loans received:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total loans received	$ None	$ None
Part 4.	Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total other receipts	$ None	$ None
Part 5.	Transfers in:		
	Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$ None	$ 1,628.00
	TOTAL RECEIPTS	$ 3,185.00	$ 29,491.65
SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:			
Part 6.	Communications media expenditures:		
	Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$ None	$ 911.75
Part 7.	Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ 946.35	
	b. Unitemized	$ 91.30	
	Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$ 1,037.65	$ [illegible]
Part 8.	Loans made:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$ None	$ None
	Total loans made	$	

Part 9.	Non-media and other expenditures:	
	a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$ 400.00
	b. Unitemized	$ 87.40
	Total other expenditures	$ 487.40
		$ 24,588.88
Part 10.	Transfers out:	
	Itemize all (use schedule D*)	$ None
		$ None
SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$ 1,525.05
		$ 37,250.23
	Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period	$ 3,954.55
	Add total receipts (section A above)	$ 3,185.00
	Subtotal	$ 7,139.55
	Subtract total expenditures (section B above)	$ 1,525.05
	Cash on hand at close of reporting period	$ 5,614.50
SECTION D—DEBTS AND OBLIGATIONS:		
Part 11.	Debts and obligations owed *to* the committee (use schedule E*)	$ None
Part 12.	Debts and obligations owed *by* the committee (use schedule E*)	$ 10,664.52

*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. (See each Schedule for instructions.) When itemization is unnecessary for a given Part, the total of any amounts for that Part is to be entered as a lump sum on the "Unitemized" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report when no amount is being reported.

[000217]

SUMMARY PAGE

Name of Committee GARY HART SENATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE, INC.

REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM June 1, 1974 THRU June 20, 1974 - AMENDED

		Column A—This period	Column B—Calendar year to date
SECTION A—RECEIPTS:			
Part 1.	Individual contributions:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 5,499.00	
	b. Unitemized	$ illegible	
	Total individual contributions	$ illegible	$ illegible
Part 2.	Sales and collections:		
	Itemized (use schedule B and as necessary schedule A*)	$ 1,384.09	$ illegible
Part 3.	Loans received:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total loans received	$ illegible	$ illegible
Part 4.	Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total other receipts	$ illegible	$ illegible
Part 5.	Transfers in:		
	Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$ none	$ 1,628.00
	TOTAL RECEIPTS	$ 7,504.80	$ 36,306.65
SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:			
Part 6.	Communications media expenditures:		
	Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$ 400.00	$ 911.75
Part 7.	Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ 1,724.12	
	b. Unitemized	$ 46.28	
	Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$ illegible	$ illegible
Part 8.	Loans made:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total loans made	$ none	$ none
Part 9.	Non-media and other expenditures:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$ 2,834.03	
	b. Unitemized	$ illegible	
	Total other expenditures	$ illegible	$ illegible

Part 10. Transfers out:		
Itemize all (use schedule D*)	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]
SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:		
Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period	$ [illegible]	
Add total receipts (section A above)	$ [illegible]	
Subtotal	$ [illegible]	
Subtract total expenditures (section B above)	$ [illegible]	
Cash on hand at close of reporting period	$ [illegible]	
SECTION D—DEBTS AND OBLIGATIONS:		
Part 11. Debts and obligations owed to the committee (use schedule E*)	$ [illegible]	
Part 12. Debts and obligations owed by the committee (use schedule E*)	$ [illegible]	

*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. (See each Schedule for instructions.) When itemization is unnecessary for a given Part, the total of any amounts for that Part is to be entered as a lump sum on the "Unitemized" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report when no amount is being reported.

604

[000218]

SUMMARY PAGE

Name of Committee GARY HART SENATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE, INC.

REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM Mar. 1, 1974 THRU May 31 1974 - AMENDED

	Column A—This period	Column B—Calendar year to date
SECTION A—RECEIPTS:		
Part 1. Individual contributions:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 11,136.81	
b. Unitemized	$ 2,720.41	
Total individual contributions	$ 13,857.22	$ 25,313.63
Part 2. Sales and collections: Itemized (use schedule B and as necessary schedule A*)	$ 1,801.16	$ 1,801.16
Part 3. Loans received:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total loans received	$ NONE	$ NONE
Part 4. Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total other receipts	$ NONE	$ NONE

605

Part 5.	Transfers in: Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$ none	$ 1,621.00
	TOTAL RECEIPTS	$ 15,668.40	$ 22,201.25
SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:			
Part 6.	Communications media expenditures: Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$ 232.30	$ [illegible]
Part 7.	Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ [illegible]	
	b. Unitemized	$ [illegible]	
	Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]
Part 8.	Loans made:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total loans made	$	$
Part 9.	Non-media and other expenditures:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$ [illegible]	
	b. Unitemized	$ [illegible]	
	Total other expenditures	$	$ [illegible]
Part 10.	Transfers out: Itemize all (use schedule D*)	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$ [illegible]	$ [illegible]

SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:

Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period	$ 5,673.45
Add total receipts (section A above)	$ [illegible]
Subtotal	$ [illegible]
Subtract total expenditures (section B above)	$ [illegible]
Cash on hand at close of reporting period	$ [illegible]

SECTION D—DEBTS AND OBLIGATIONS:

Part 11. Debts and obligations owed *to* the committee (use schedule E*)	$ [illegible]
Part 12. Debts and obligations owed *by* the committee (use schedule E*)	$ [illegible]

*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. (See each Schedule for instructions.) When itemization is unnecessary for a given Part, the total of any amounts for that Part is to be entered as a lump sum on the "Unitemized" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report where no amount is being reported.

[000219]

SUMMARY PAGE

Name of Committee GARY HART SENATE CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE, INC.

REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM Jan. 1 1974 THRU Feb. 28, 1974 AMENDED

	Column A—This period	Column B—Calendar year to date
SECTION A—RECEIPTS:		
Part 1. Individual contributions:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 4275.00	
b. Unitemized	$ 7045.36	
Total individual contributions	$ [illegible]	$ 11,320.36

909 607

Part 2.	Sales and collections: Itemized (use schedule B and as necessary schedule A*)	$ 155.71	$ 155.71
Part 3.	Loans received:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total loans received	$ none	$ none
Part 4.	Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):		
	a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total other receipts	$ none	$ none
Part 5.	Transfers in:		
	Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$ 1628.00	$ 1,628.00
	TOTAL RECEIPTS	$ 13,133.36	$ 13,133.36

SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:

Part 6.	Communications media expenditures: Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$ 278.75	$ 278.75
Part 7.	Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ 2,027.41	
	b. Unitemized	$ 123.51	
	Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$ 2,150.92	$ 2,150.92

Part 8.	Loans made:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total loans made	$ none	$ none
Part 9.	Non-media and other expenditures:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$ 7,980.41	
	b. Unitemized	$ 417.71	
	Total other expenditures	$ 8,398.12	$ 8,398.12
Part 10.	Transfers out:		
	Itemize all (use schedule D*)	$ none	$ none
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$ 10,827.79	$ 10,827.79

SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:

Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period	$ 2,373.03
Add total receipts (section A above)	$ 13,133.36
Subtotal	$ 15,506.39
Subtract total expenditures (section B above)	$ 10,827.79
Cash on hand at close of reporting period	$ 4,678.60

SECTION D—DEBTS AND OBLIGATIONS:

Part 11. Debts and obligations owed *to* the committee (use schedule E*)	$ none
Part 12. Debts and obligations owed *by* the committee (use schedule F*)	$ 2,212.72

*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. (See each Schedule for instructions.) When itemization is unnecessary for a given Part, the total of any amounts for that Part is to be entered as a lump sum on the "Unitemized" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report where no amount is being reported.

[000220]

SUMMARY PAGE

Name of Candidate Gary W. Hart

REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM Oct. 25, 1974 THRU Dec. 31, 1974.

	Column A — This period	Column B — Calendar year to date
SECTION A—RECEIPTS:		
Part 1. Individual contributions:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total individual contributions	$	$
Part 2. Sales and collections: Itemized (use schedule B and as necessary schedule A*)	$	$
Part 3. Loans received:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total loans received	$	$
Part 4. Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 2,891.54	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total other receipts	$ 2,891.54	$ 5,671.34
Part 5. Transfers in: Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$	$
TOTAL RECEIPTS	$ 2,891.54	$ 5,671.34
SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:		
Part 6. Communications media expenditures: Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$	$
Part 7. Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:		
a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ 2,764.81	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$ 2,764.81	$ 5,671.34
Part 8. Loans made:		
a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total loans made	$	$
Part 9. Non-media and other expenditures:		
a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total other expenditures	$	$
Part 10. Transfers out: Itemize all (use schedule D*)	$	$
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$ 2,764.81	$ 5,671.34

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:

Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period	$ (126.73)
Add total receipts (section A above)	$ 2,891.54
Subtotal	$ 2,764.81
Subtract total expenditures (section B above)	$ 2,764.81
Cash on hand at close of reporting period	$

*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. (See each Schedule for instructions.) When any Schedule is used for any Part, the total of any amounts for that Part is to be entered as a lump sum on the "Unitemized" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Report section on the same report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report section on any report where no amount is to be reported.

[000221]

Name of Candidate GARY W. HART

SUMMARY REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM Oct. 15, 1974 THRU October 24, 1974

	Column A—This period	Column B—Calendar year to date
SECTION A—RECEIPTS:		
Part 1. Individual contributions:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total individual contributions	$	$
Part 2. Sales and collections:		
Itemized (use schedule B*)	$	$
Part 3. Loans received:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total loans received	$	$
Part 4. Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 1,000.00	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total other receipts	$ 1,000.00	$ 2,779.80
Part 5. Transfers in:		
Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$	$
TOTAL RECEIPTS	$ 1,000.00	$ 2,779.80
SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:		
Part 6. Communications media expenditures:		
Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$	$
Part 7. Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:		
a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$	$ 2,906.53
Part 8. Loans made:		
a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total loans made	$	$

612

613

Part 9. Other expenditures:

a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total other expenditures	$	$

Part 10. Transfers out:

Itemize all (use schedule D*)	$	$
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$	$ 2,906.53

SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:

Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period	$ (1,126.73)
Add total receipts (section A above)	$ 1,000.00
Subtotal	$ (126.73)
Subtract total expenditures (section B above)	$
Cash on hand at close of reporting period	$ (126.73)

*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. See each Schedule for instructions. When itemization is necessary for a given Part, the total of any amounts for that Part is to be entered on the "Itemized" line of the appropriate part of the Summary Report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report when no amount is being reported.

614

[0002221]

Name of Candidate Gary W. Hart

SUMMARY REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM Aug. 30, 1974 THRU Oct. 14, 1974

SECTION A—RECEIPTS:

	Column A—This period	Column B—Calendar year to date
Part 1. Individual contributions:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total individual contributions	$	$
Part 2. Sales and collections:		
Itemized (use schedule B*)	$	$
Part 3. Loans received:		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total loans received	$	$
Part 4. Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*)	$ 1,679.80	
b. Unitemized	$	
Total other receipts	$ 1,679.80	$ 1,7 .80
Part 5. Transfers in:		
Itemize all (use schedule A*)	$	$
TOTAL RECEIPTS	$ 1,679.80	$ 1,779.80

615

SECTION B—EXPENDITURES:

Part 6.	Communications media expenditures:		
	Itemize all (use schedule C*)	$	$
Part 7.	Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$ 2,806.53	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	$ 2,806.53	$ 2,906.53
Part 8.	Loans made:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule D*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total loans made	$	$
Part 9.	Other expenditures:		
	a. Itemized (use schedule C*)	$	
	b. Unitemized	$	
	Total other expenditures	$	$
Part 10.	Transfers out:		
	Itemize all (use schedule D*)	$	$
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$ 2,806.53	$ 2,906.53

SECTION C—CASH BALANCES:

Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period	$ -0-
Add total receipts (section A above)	$ 1,679.80
Subtotal	$ 1,679.80
Subtract total expenditures (section B above)	$ 2,305.53
Cash on hand at close of reporting period	$ (1,128.73)

*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. (See each Schedule for instructions.) When itemization is unnecessary for a given Part, the total of any amounts for that Part are to be entered as a lump sum on the "Unitemized" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report where no amount is being reported.

[000223]

4. The follow list adjusts 1972 expenditures for the 1972 Senate Races (multiplied by 1.18) in light of the 18 percent rise in the Cost of Living Index between calendar year 1972 and calendar year 1974:

[000224]

EXPENDITURES FOR ALL 1972 SENATE RACES
(Multiplied By 1.18)

Candidates	Total Expenditures x 1.18
ALABAMA	
John Sparkman (D)	828,489
Winton Blount (R)	902,654
ALASKA	
Ted Stevens (R)	230,245
Gene Guess (D)	55,615
ARKANSAS	
John McClellan (D)	609,556
Wayne Babbitt (R)	85,719
COLORADO	
Floyd Haskell (D)	207,967
Gordon Allott (R)	363,800
DELAWARE	
Joseph Biden (D)	309,985
Caleb Boggs (R)	197,835
GEORGIA	
Sam Nunn (D)	670,202
Fletcher Thompson (R)	524,669
IDAHO	
James McClure (R)	478,830
William Davis (D)	241,756
ILLINOIS	
Charles Percy (R)	1,662,410
Roman Pucinski (D)	395,869
IOWA	
Dick Clark (D)	285,328
Jack Miller (R)	387,350
KANSAS	
James Pearson (R)	124,668
Arch Tetzlaff (D)	7,956
KENTUCKY	
Walter Huddleston (D)	777,136
Louie Nunn (R)	712,306

Candidates	Total Expenditures x 1.18
LOUISIANA	
Bennett Johnston (D)	603,707
John McKeithen (I)	465,522
Ben Toledano (R)	184,489
MAINE	
William Hathaway (D)	238,605
Margaret C. Smith (R)	17,641
MASSACHUSETTS	
Edward Brooke (R)	434,285
John Droney (D)	97,808
MICHIGAN	
Robert Griffin (R)	1,646,014
Frank Kelley (D)	646,426
MINNESOTA	
Walter Mondale (D)	635,468
Philip Hansen (R)	359,605
MISSISSIPPI	
James Eastland (D)	484,061
Gil Carmichael (R)	179,987
MONTANA	
Lee Metcalf (D)	161,130
Henry Hibbard (R)	338,363
NEBRASKA	
Carl Curtis (R)	295,463
Terry Carpenter (D)	45,582
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Thomas McIntyre (D)	97,704
Wesley Powell (R)	123,639
NEW JERSEY	
Clifford Case (R)	171,425
Paul Krebs (D)	54,469
NEW MEXICO	
Pete Domenici (R)	610,426
Jack Daniels (D)	586,436
NORTH CAROLINA	
Jesse Helms (R)	772,010
Nick Galifianakis (D)	554,710

Candidates	Total Expenditures x 1.18
OKLAHOMA	
Dewey Bartlett (R)	737,612
Ed Edmondson (D)	604,228
OREGON	
Mark Hatfield (R)	353,359
Wayne Morse (D)	297,247
RHODE ISLAND	
Claiborne Pell (D)	623,449
John Chafee (R)	539,743
SOUTH CAROLINA	
Strom Thurmond (R)	786,268
Eugene Zeigler (D)	197,951
SOUTH DAKOTA	
James Abourezk (D)	503,934
Robert Hirsch (R)	354,944
TENNESSEE	
Howard Baker (R)	980,307
Leonard Blanton (D)	288,691
TEXAS	
John Tower (R)	2,716,207
Barefoot Sanders (D)	742,229
VIRGINIA	
William Scott (R)	731,491
William Spong (D)	449,487
WEST VIRGINIA	
Jennings Randolph (D)	157,731
Louise Leonard (R)	53,705
WYOMING	
Clifford Hansen (R)	200,456
Mike Vinich (D)	12,285

5. The following list adjusts 1972 expenditures for 1972 House Races (multiplied by 1.18) in light of the 18 percent rise in the Cost of Living Index between calendar year 1972 and calendar year 1974:

Expenditures for all 1972 House Races (Multiplied by 1.18)

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	X 1.18
	ALABAMA					
1	Jack Edwards* (R)	No Opp.	76.5%	$ 42,862	$ 27,612	32,582
	D.W. McCrory (D)	69.3%	17.8	525	1,063	1,254
2	William Dickinson* (R)	No Opp.	54.8	61,432	50,193	59,228
	Ben C. Reeves (D) **	52.8	41.5	122,603	122,067	144,039
3	Bill Nichols* (D)	No Opp.	75.6	44,377	34,984	41,281
	Robert Kerr (R)	No Opp.	20.6	7,019	6,718	7,927
4	Tom Bevill* (D)	91.3	69.6	49,265	38,918	45,923
	Ed Nelson (R)	49.7	30.0	12,550	12,550	14,807
5	Robert E. Jones* (D)	78.1	74.2	33,596	30,786	36,327
	Dieter J. Schrader (R)	No Opp.	24.4	11,175	11,175	13,187
6	John Buchanan* (R)	No Opp.	59.8	35,898	33,976	40,092
	Ben L. Erdreich (D)	81.3	35.6	18,947	18,947	22,357
7	Walter Flowers* (D)	64.8	84.8	18,277	16,303	19,238
	ALASKA					
1	Nick Begich* (D)	No Opp.	56.2	77,565	64,893	76,574
	Don Young (R)	84.5	43.8	47,781	46,300	54,634

Cong. Dist		Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.18
	ARIZONA					
1	John J. Rhodes* (R)	88.1	57.3	73,267	48,315	57,011
	Gerald Pollock (D)	62.7	42.7	27,755	28,646	33,802
2	Morris K. Udall* (D)	No Opp.	63.5	38,174	38,174	45,045
	Gene Savoie (R)	No Opp.	36.5	32,791	31,694	37,419
3	Sam Steiger* (R)	No Opp.	63.0	55,446	37,691	44,475
	Ted Wyckoff (D)	No Opp.	37.0	24,629	24,648	29,085
4	*John Conlan (R)*	*61.5*	*53.0*	*150,341*	*154,662*	182,501
	Jack Brown (D)	*37.1*	*47.0*	*303,719*	*318,254*	375,540
	ARKANSAS					
1	Bill Alexander* (D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	1,040	-0-	
2	Wilbur Mills* (D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	-0-	-0-	
3	John P. Hammerschmidt* (R)	No Opp.	77.3	34,683	27,588	32,554
	Guy W. Hatfield (D) **	53.0	22.7	4,138	4,243	5,007
4	*Ray Thornton (D)*	*51.3*	*No Opp.*	*51,854*	*51,854*	61,188

624

[000229]

Source: Common Cause
Campaign Monitoring Project

Cong. Dist		Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.18
	CALIFORNIA					
1	Don H. Clausen* (R)	No Opp.	62.3%	$ 70,526	$ 49,450	58,351
	William Nighswonger (D)	44.4%	34.2	6,632	6,601	7,789
2	Harold Johnson* (D)	No Opp.	68.4	60,906	37,981	44,818
	Francis X. Callahan (R)	53.1	28.7	28,966	28,985	34,202
3	John E. Moss* (D)	No Opp.	69.9	50,799	39,314	46,391
	John Rakus (R)	57.4	30.1	8,049	8,042	9,490
4	Robert Leggett* (D)	No Opp.	67.4	18,971	19,128	22,571
	Benjamin Chang (R)	53.8	32.6	24,957	24,957	29,449
5	Phillip Burton* (D)	66.7	81.8	53,606	46,899	55,341
	Edlo E. Powell (R)	No Opp.	18.2	19,076	18,715	22,084
6	William Mailliard* (R)	No Opp.	52.1	165,636	148,550	175,289
	Roger Boas (D)	77.7	47.9	265,272	266,760	314,777
7	Ronald Dellums* (D)	73.1	55.9	91,259	100,853	119,007
	Peter Hannaford (R)	39.3	38.1	104,530	100,286	118,338
	Frank Cortese (Am. Ind.)	No Opp.	6.0	48,980	48,980	58,776
8	*Fortney Stark (D)*	*55.7*	*52.9*	*217,246*	*266,664*	314,684
	Lew H. Warden (R)	*64.5*	*47.1*	*39,748*	*44,493*	52,502
9	Don Edwards* (D)	87.4	72.3	27,592	25,398	29,970
	Herb Smith (R)	No Opp.	25.1	5,386	4,792	5,655

625

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.13
10	Charles Gubser* (R)	No Opp.	64.6	63,136	48,529	57,264
	Frank Gillette (D)	51.4	35.4	26,848	26,433	31,171
11	*Leo Ryan (D)*	*No Opp.*	*60.5*	*53,033*	*52,127*	*61,510*
	Charles Chase (R)	*53.6*	*36.9*	*52,622*	*52,441*	*61,900*
12	Burt Talcott* (R)	No Opp.	54.0	71,760	61,828	72,957
	Julian Camacho (D)	58.1	43.1	57,870	57,665	68,024
13	Charles Teague* (R)	No Opp.	73.8	47,791	39,546	46,664
	Lester Cleveland (D)	No Opp.	26.1	8,998	10,143	11,969
14	Jerome Waldie* (D)	No Opp.	77.6	48,272	47,160	55,649
	Floyd Sims (R)	No Opp.	22.4	4,604	4,524	5,338
15	John McFall* (D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	35,776	22,647	26,723
16	B.F. Sisk* (D)	No Opp.	79.1	90,472	54,890	64,770
	Carol Harner (R)	No Opp.	20.9	17,728	19,219	22,678
17	Paul McCloskey*(R)	43.7	54.6	313,856	321,550	377,438
	James Stewart (D)	36.8	35.9	103,905	109,418	129,113
	James Knapp (I)	No Opp.	9.5	76,068	75,970	89,645
18	Robert Mathias*(R)	No Opp.	66.4	66,570	47,737	56,330
	Vincent Lavery (D)	No Opp.	33.6	9,624	10,072	11,885
19	Chet Holifield*(D)	51.9	67.2	50,311	26,110	30,810
	Kenneth Fisher (R)	66.6	27.9	5,754	5,202	6,138
20	*Carlos Moorhead (R)*	*51.2*	*57.4*	*104,140*	*97,617*	*115,188*
	John Binkley (D)	*No Opp.*	*42.6*	*52,793*	*56,380*	*66,528*
21	Augustus Hawkins*(D)	No Opp.	82.9	14,112	10,459	12,342
	Rayfield Lundy (R)	No Opp.	17.1	325	325	384
22	James Corman*(D)	85.5	67.6	50,895	50,544	67,091
	Bruce Wolfe (R)	65.8	29.3	17,992	19,169	22,619

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.13
	CALIFORNIA CONT'd					
23	Del Clawson*(R)	No Opp.	61.4%	$ 73,016	$ 65,007	76,758
	Conrad Tuohey (D)	54.1%	38.6	39,039	45,844	54,090
24	John Rousselot*(R)	No Opp.	70.1	67,970	61,473	72,538
	Luther Mandell (D)	66.0	29.9	4,660	4,660	5,498
25	Charles Wiggins*(R)	No Opp.	64.9	53,107	34,643	40,879
	Leslie Craven (D)	64.5	31.9	5,926	5,925	6,992
26	Thomas Rees*(D)	86.1	68.6	70,820	45,963	54,236
	Philip Rutta (R)	78.1	27.9	229	193	223
27	Barry Goldwater,Jr.*(R)	No Opp.	57.4	134,263	134,263	158,430
	Mark Novak (D)	37.0	42.6	44,292	42,840	50,551
28	Alphonzo Bell*(R)	No Opp.	60.7	50,604	48,719	57,488
	Mike Shapiro (D)	68.7	37.5	56,437	60,424	71,300
29	George Danielson*(D)	No Opp.	62.7	50,186	30,832	36,382
	Richard Ferraro (R)	No Opp.	33.5	14,533	14,526	17,141
30	Edward Roybal*(D)	85.7	68.4	26,224	24,574	28,997
	Bill Brophy (R)	83.0	28.6	27,681	31,143	36,749
31	Charles Wilson*(D)	50.7	52.3	67,942	67,713	79,921
	Ben Valentine (R)	No Opp.	42.5	63,432	62,875	74,193
32	Craig Hosmer*(R)	No Opp.	65.9	47,529	23,572	27,815
	Dennis Murray (D)	55.0	31.9	25,252	23,072	27,225

Cong. Dist.		Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.18
33	Jerry Pettis*(R)	No Opp.	75.0	80,029	36,833	43,643
	Ken Thompson (D)	48.7	25.0	5,151	5,311	6,267
34	Richard Hanna*(D)	No Opp.	67.1	74,530	40,785	48,126
	John Ratterree (R)	55.4	29.0	13,850	13,181	15,554
35	Glenn Anderson*(D)	No Opp.	74.8	61,574	38,077	44,931
	Vernon Brown (R)	No Opp.	25.2	214	3,079	3,633
36	*William Ketchum (R)*	*80.9*	*52.7*	*111,303*	*106,576*	*125,760*
	Timothy Lenucchi (D)	*28.5*	*43.5*	*57,013*	*58,066*	*68,518*
	William Armour (AI)	*No Opp.*	*3.8*	*15,938*	*16,913*	*19,957*
37	*Yvonne B. Burke (D)*	*53.6*	*73.2*	*131,756*	*138,024*	*162,868*
	Gregg Tria (R)	*59.7*	*24.6*	*24,112*	*24,112*	*28,452*
38	*George Brown, Jr. (D)*	*28.2*	*55.9*	*154,932*	*154,743*	*182,597*
	Howard Snider (R)	*45.4*	*43.4*	*109,509*	*108,537*	*128,074*
39	*Andrew Hinshaw (R)*	*45.6*	*65.7*	*162,293*	*161,614*	*190,704*
	John Black (D)	*47.0*	*34.3*	*10,549*	*10,515*	*12,407*
40	Bob Wilson*(R)	No Opp.	67.8	49,638	32,066	37,838
	Frank Caprio (D)	No Opp.	30.3	6,718	7,349	8,672
41	Lionel Van Deerlin*(D)	No Opp.	74.0	69,936	44,931	53,019
	Richard Kau (R)	No Opp.	26.0	16,231	15,776	18,616
42	*Clair Burgener (R)*	*78.7*	*67.5*	*107,395*	*91,664*	*108,164*
	Robert Love (D)	*52.6*	*29.1*	*4,952*	*4,917*	*5,802*
43	Victor Veysey*(R)	No Opp.	62.7	73,823	60,432	71,310
	Ernest Robles (D)	78.8	37.3	21,920	21,920	25,866

628

[000231]

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.18
	COLORADO					
1	Patricia Schroeder (D)	54.8%	51.6%	$ 86,007	$ 80,508	94,997
	James McKevitt*(R)	No Opp.	47.5	109,535	78,436	92,554
2	Donald Brotzman*(R)	No Opp.	66.3	81,784	60,004	70,805
	Francis Brush (D)	No Opp.	33.4	5,419	5,509	6,501
3	Frank Evans*(D)	No Opp.	66.3	58,426	45,734	53,966
	Charles Brady (R)	77.9	33.7	9,435	9,435	11,133
4	*James Johnson (R)*	*60.3*	*51.0*	*59,855*	*51,747*	*61,061*
	Alan Merson (D)	*52.7*	*49.0*	*88,504*	*104,334*	*123,114*
5	*William Armstrong (R)*	*No Opp.*	*62.3*	*97,142*	*88,536*	*104,473*
	Byron Johnson (D)	*66.7*	*36.5*	*17,291*	*17,273*	*20,382*
	CONNECTICUT					
1	William Cotter*(D)	No Opp.	56.9	96,208	96,208	113,525
	Richard Rittenband (R)	No Opp.	41.9	56,375	55,985	66,062
2	Robert Steele*(R)	No Opp.	65.9	141,485	141,485	166,952
	Roger Hilsman (D)	No Opp.	34.1	60,575	60,226	71,067
3	Robert Giaimo*(D)	No Opp.	53.3	79,997	79,608	93,937
	Henry Povinelli (R)	No Opp.	46.7	35,046	33,591	39,637
4	Stewart McKinney*(R)	No Opp.	63.1	96,679	112,669	132,949
	James McLoughlin (D)	No Opp.	36.9	41,009	39,809	46,974

629

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.18
	FLORIDA CONT'D					
11	Paul Rogers*(D)	No Opp.	60.2%	$ 104,917	$ 87,253	102,958
	Joel Gustafson(R)	No Opp.	39.8	59,108	59,108	69,747
12	Herbert Burke*(R)	No Opp.	62.8	38,195	30,600	36,108
	James Stephanis (D)	No Opp.	37.2	56,434	56,434	66,592
13	*William Lehman (D)* **	*57.6*	*61.6*	*123,658*	*122,725*	*144,815*
	Paul Bethel (R)	*56.1*	*38.4*	*34,010*	*31,660*	*37,359*
14	Claude Pepper*(D)	64.3	67.6	95,863	95,964	113,120
	Evelio Estrella (R)	No Opp.	32.4	44,007	34,921	41,207
15	Dante Fascell*(D)	No Opp.	56.8	63,690	61,370	72,417
	Ellis Rubin (R)	51.6	43.2	9,511	9,522	11,236
	GEORGIA					
1	*Ronald Ginn (D)* **	*55.1*	*No Opp.*	*106,000*	*76,835*	*90,665*
2	Dawson Mathis*(D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	4,548	2,042	2,410
3	Jack Brinkley*(D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	2,125	1,030	1,215
4	Ben Blackburn*(R)	No Opp.	75.9	46,335	34,276	40,446
	Odell Welborn (D)	58.9	24.1	3,886	3,886	4,585
5	*Andrew Young (D)*	*60.7*	*52.8*	*170,051*	*159,421*	*188,117*
	Rodney Cook (R)	*No Opp.*	*47.2*	*160,321*	*149,615*	*176,547*

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.1
6	John Flynt*(D)	76.9	No Opp.	14,204	2,612	3,073.
7	John Davis*(D)	52.1	58.3	32,249	18,500	21,527
	Charles Sherrill (R)	60.7	41.7	4,511	4,511	5,322
8	W.S. Stuckey*(D)	65.7	62.4	105,282	103,254	121,840
	Ronnie Thompson (R)	No Opp.	37.6	17,061	17,448	20,589
9	Phil Landrum*(D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	2,970	1,378	1,626
10	Robert Stephens*(D)	85.3	No Opp.	13,421	8,520	10,054
	HAWAII					
1	Spark Matsunaga*(D)	No Opp.	54.7	177,389	127,753	150,748
	Fred Rohlfing (R)	91.4	45.3	183,448	179,221	211,481
2	Patsy Mink* (D)	74.8	57.1	82,348	71,620	84,512
	Diana Hansen (R)	No Opp.	42.9	44,390	39,836	47,006
	IDAHO					
1	*Steven D. Symms (R)*	*45.7*	*55.6*	*92,099*	*89,306*	*105,381*
	Edward V. Williams (D)	*No Opp.*	*44.4*	*59,819*	*59,565*	*70,310*
2	Orval Hansen*(R)	No Opp.	69.2	26,516	11,457	13,519
	Willis H. Ludlow (D)	No Opp.	27.0	14,360	13,632	16,086
	ILLINOIS					
1	Ralph H. Metcalfe*(D)	No Opp.	91.4	21,036	9,861	11,636
	Louis Coggs (R)	No Opp.	8.6	-0-	1,235	1,457
2	Morgan F. Murphy*(D)	No Opp.	75.0	30,109	22,510	26,562
	James E. Doyle (R)	No Opp.	25.0	4,250	3,044	3,592
3	*Robert P. Hanrahan (R)*	*72.3*	*62.3*	*36,229*	*34,838*	*41,110*
	Daniel P. Coman (D)	*No Opp.*	*37.7*	*40,954*	*40,715*	*48,047*

632

[000233]

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.1
	ILLINOIS CONT'D					
4	Edward J. Derwinski*(R)	No Opp.	70.5%	$ 22,862	$ 17,896	21,117
	C. F. Dore (D)	51.4%	29.5	12,155	11,342	13,384
5	John C. Kluczynski *(D)	86.5	72.8	20,566	12,936	15,264
	Leonard C. Jarzab (R)	No Opp.	27.2	-0-	1,694	1,999
6	Harold R. Collier*(R)	No Opp.	61.2	35,195	32,303	38,118
	Michael R. Galasso(D)	No Opp.	38.8	40,050	40,050	47,259
7	George W. Collins*(D)	83.8	82.8	5,535	1,585	1,870
	Thomas J. Lento (R)	No Opp.	17.2	792	792	935
8	Dan Rostenkowski*(D)	No Opp.	74.0	25,943	13,737	16,210
	Edward L. Stepnowski (R)	No Opp.	26.0	225	225	266
9	Sidney R. Yates*(D)	No Opp.	68.3	56,767	29,723	35,073
	Clark W. Fetridge (R)	No Opp.	31.7	16,679	16,353	19,297
10	Samuel H. Young (R)	59.7	51.6	195,219	206,166	243,276
	Abner J. Mikva*(D)	65.6	48.4	220,944	218,543	257,881
11	Frank Annunzio*(D)	No Opp.	53.3	122,484	117,415	138,550
	John J. Hoellen (R)	69.7	46.7	91,467	108,126	127,589
12	Philip M. Crane*(R)	No Opp.	74.2	61,574	52,661	62,140
	Edwin L. Frank (D)	No Opp.	25.8	4,225	4,154	4,902
13	Robert McClory*(R)	No Opp.	61.5	24,603	25,010	29,512
	Stanley W. Beetham (D)	No Opp.	38.5	18,607	20,120	23,742

633

Cong. Dist.		Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.18
14	John V. Erlenborn*(R)	No Opp.	72.8	28,004	24,871	29,348
	James M. Wall (D)	No Opp.	27.2	7,392	7,183	8,476
15	Leslie C. Arends*(R)	57.2	57.2	43,007	33,450	39,471
	Tim L. Hall (D)	52.8	42.8	5,119	7,753	9,149
16	John B. Anderson*(R)	No Opp.	71.9	48,050	33,544	39,582
	John E. Devine, Jr. (D)	69.0	28.1	1,522	1,463	1,726
17	*George M. O'Brien (R)*	*No Opp.*	*55.6*	*59,980*	*55,300*	*65,325*
	John J. Houlihan (D)	*No Opp.*	*44.4*	*32,748*	*32,756*	*38,643*
18	Robert H. Michel*(R)	No Opp.	64.8	22,976	20,850	24,603
	Steven L. Nordvall (D)	65.3	35.2	2,667	2,901	3,423
19	Tom Railsback*(R)	No Opp.	No Opp.	27,185	25,610	30,220
20	Paul Findley *(R)	No Opp.	68.8	84,683	71,187	84,001
	Robert S. O'Shea (D)	No Opp.	31.2	15,671	15,671	18,492
21	*Edward R. Madigan (R)*	*68.7*	*54.8*	*86,573*	*85,938*	*101,407*
	Lawrence E. Johnson (D)	*No Opp.*	*45.2*	*30,577*	*29,802*	*35,166*
22	George E. Shipley*(D)	No Opp.	56.5	55,343	52,812	62,318
	Robert L. Lamkin (R)	No Opp.	41.0	60,046	83,554	98,594
23	Melvin Price*(D)	No Opp.	75.1	24,435	17,134	20,218
	Robert Mays (R)	39.7	24.9	1,691	2,734	3,226
24	Kenneth J. Gray*(D)	No Opp.	93.7	27,941	11,624	13,716
	INDIANA					
1	Ray J. Madden*(D)	46.5	56.9	66,678	72,655	85,733
	Bruce Haller (R)	71.0	43.1	8,690	9,551	11,270

Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project

Cong. Dist.		Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.18
	INDIANA CONT'D					
2	Earl F. Landgrebe*(R)	54.5%	54.7%	$ 70,700	$ 55,474	65,459
	Floyd J. Fithian (D)	No Opp.	45.3	43,015	44,359	52,344
3	John Brademas*(D)	No Opp.	55.2	140,906	133,634	157,688
	Don M. Newman (R)	74.9	43.2	45,160	45,160	53,289
4	Edward Roush*(D)	No Opp.	51.5	63,875	63,613	75,063
	Allan Bloom (R)	48.0	48.5	123,796	165,984	195,861
5	Elwood Hillis*(R)	85.9	64.1	71,309	64,781	76,441
	Kathleen Williams (D)	37.5	35.9	6,644	9,026	10,651
6	William G. Bray*(R)	No Opp.	64.8	36,341	32,297	38,110
	David W. Evans (D)	No Opp.	35.2	8,296	8,253	9,739
7	John T. Myers* (R)	No Opp.	61.6	58,855	58,186	68,660
	Warren R. Henegar (D)	66.5	38.4	30,950	40,000	47,200
8	Roger H. Zion*(R)	No Opp.	63.4	48,192	24,731	29,183
	Richard L. Deen (D)	62.9	36.6	1,634	1,634	1,928
9	Lee H. Hamilton*(D)	No Opp.	62.9	63,625	61,021	72,005
	William A. Johnson (R)	37.9	37.1	6,555	6,389	7,539
10	David W. Dennis*(R)	No Opp.	57.2	52,731	51,906	61,249
	Phillip R. Sharp (D)	67.0	42.8	69,879	69,879	82,457
11	William H. Hudnut III (R)	45.5	51.2	163,442	165,016	194,719
	Andrew R. Jacobs * (D)	84.7	48.8	71,166	64,422	76,018

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.19
	IOWA					
1	Edward Mezvinsky (D)	63.7	53.4	116,349	113,546	135,120
	Fred Schwengel*(R)	No Opp.	45.7	69,514	69,615	82,842
2	John C. Culver*(D)	No Opp.	59.2	59,910	40,794	48,537
	Theodore R. Ellsworth (R)	No Opp.	40.8	63,480	67,946	80,856
3	H. R. Gross*(R)	No Opp.	55.7	43,963	41,053	48,853
	Lyle Taylor (D)	62.4	44.3	26,795	26,795	31,886
4	Neal Smith*(D)	No Opp.	59.6	57,382	56,370	67,080
	John H. Kyl*(R)	No Opp.	40.4	108,153	112,154	133,463
5	William J. Scherle*(R)	No Opp.	55.3	47,296	35,105	41,775
	Thomas Harkin (D)	No Opp.	44.7	25,871	24,437	29,080
6	Wiley Mayne*(R)	No Opp.	52.5	54,232	50,166	59,698
	Berkley Bedell (D)	No Opp.	47.5	87,712	87,694	104,356
	KANSAS					
1	Keith G. Sebelius*(R)	No Opp.	77.2	53,186	20,545	24,448
	Morris Coover (D)	No Opp.	21.6	-0-	-0-	
2	William R. Roy*(D)	No Opp.	60.6	145,381	148,995	177,304
	Charles D. McAtee (R)	63.4	37.1	116,087	115,985	138,022
3	Larry N. Winn*(R)	No Opp.	71.0	46,191	37,310	44,399
	Charles Barsotti (D)	No Opp.	25.4	5,991	5,991	7,129
4	Garner E. Shriver*(R)	No Opp.	73.2	47,682	34,954	41,595
	John S. Stevens (D)	50.7	24.8	7,300	6,557	7,803
5	Joe Skubitz*(R)	No Opp.	72.3	28,251	21,765	25,900
	Lloyd Kitch (D)	No Opp.	27.7	3,785	3,676	4,374

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.19
	KENTUCKY					
1	Frank A. Stubblefield*(D)	73.1%	64.8%	$ 30,055	$ 30,940	36,819
	Charles T. Banken, Jr. (R)	No Opp.	33.7	1,655	2,558	3,044
2	William H. Natcher*(D)	No Opp.	61.5	9,396	9,396	11,182
	J. G. Carter (R)	No Opp.	38.5	1,699	7,327	8,719
3	Romano L. Mazzoli*(D)	93.9	62.1	63,140	58,410	69,508
	Phil Kaelin, Jr. (R)	70.7	37.0	19,648	21,161	25,182
4	M. G. Snyder*(R)	No Opp.	73.8	77,274	29,411	35,000
	James W. Rogers (D)	46.0	26.2	445	375	446
5	Tim Lee Carter*(R)	No Opp.	73.5	15,806	12,155	14,464
	Lyle L. Willis (D)	50.1	26.5	21	216	257
6	John B. Breckinridge (D)	57.8	52.4	65,056	69,216	82,367
	Laban P. Jackson (R)	44.1	46.8	82,177	82,152	97,761
7	Carl D. Perkins*(D)	93.4	61.9	6,455	5,746	6,838
	Robert Holcomb (R)	72.9	38.1	48,035	48,035	57,162
	LOUISIANA					
1	Edward Hebert* (D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	500	520	619
2	Hale Boggs*(D)	83.7	No Opp.	116,434	90,380	107,552
3	David C. Treen (R)	No Opp.	54.0	139,578	155,629	185,199
	J. Louis Watkins (D) **	54.2	46.0	228,495	223,767	266,283

638

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend. x 1.18
4	Joe D. Waggonner, Jr.*(D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	8,304	1,596 1,882
5	Otto E. Passman* (D)	61.0	No Opp.	38,295	37,545 44,303
6	John R. Rarick*(D)	60.8	No Opp.	53,312	42,459 50,102
7	John B. Breaux* (D)	55.0	No Opp.	141,924	137,420 162,156
8	*Gillis W. Long (D)*	*52.9*	*68.5*	*107,919*	*107,319 127,344*
	Roy C. Strickland (R)	*No Opp.*	*14.7*	*5,705*	*5,612 6,622*
	S.R. Abramson (A)	*No Opp.*	*16.8*	*21,165*	*20,835 24,585*
	MAINE				
1	Peter Kyros *(D)	66.5%	59.4%	58,245	56,093 66,190
	Robert Porteous (R)	72.4	40.6	64,303	64,104 75,643
2	*William Cohen (R)*	*60.2*	*54.4*	*126,369*	*165,337 195,168*
	Elmer Violette (D)	*78.4*	*45.6*	*81,415*	*94,696 111,741*
	MARYLAND				
1	William Mills*(R)	80.2	70.5	94,806	93,945 110,855
	John Hargreaves (D)	53.1	29.5	40,580	40,419 47,694
2	Clarence Long*(D)	76.1	65.8	71,593	66,425 78,382
	John Bishop (R)	66.0	34.2	75,928	75,606 81,215
3	Paul Sarbanes*(D)	53.3	69.7	61,203	61,272 72,301
	Robert Morrow (R)	34.1	30.3	2,505	4,498 5,308
4	*Marjorie Holt (R)*	*71.1*	*59.4*	*111,488*	*113,513 133,945*
	Werner Fornos (D)	*22.5*	*40.6*	*133,918*	*145,973 172,248*
5	Lawrence Hogan*(R)	93.5	62.9	108,488	108,282 127,773
	Edward Conroy (D)	51.4	37.1	76,584	92,301 108,915

638

[000236]

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend. x 1.18
	MARYLAND CONT'D				
6	Goodloe Byron*(D)	59.9%	64.8%	$ 77,220	$ 77,186 91,079
	Edward Mason(R)	54.5	35.2	59,065	60,333 71,193
7	Parren Mitchell*(D)	50.5	80.0	44,898	55,577 65,681
	Verdell Adair (R)	44.4	20.0	471	592 699
8	Gilbert Gude* (R)	No Opp.	63.9	74,924	70,899 83,661
	Joseph Anastasi (D)	78.3	36.1	61,904	61,904 73,047
	MASSACHUSETTS				
1	Silvio D. Conte* (R)	No Opp.	No Opp.	10,971	2,346 2,768
2	Edward P. Boland*(D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	-0-	-0-
3	Harold D. Donohue*(D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	11,415	125 148
4	Robert F. Drinan*(D)	No Opp.	48.8	191,801	199,703 235,650
	Martin A. Linsky (R)	33.5	45.8	139,576	148,285 174,976
	John Collins (In-Con)	No Opp.	5.4	23,526	22,579 26,643
5	*Paul W. Cronin (R)*	*58.5*	*53.5*	*145,532*	*171,414 202,269*
	John F. Kerry (D)	*27.5*	*44.7*	*267,615*	*273,745 330,100*
	Roger Durkin (I)	*No Opp.*	*1.8*	*45,572*	*62,982 74,258*
6	Michael Harrington*(D)	74.3	64.1	115,546	114,317 134,894
	James Brady Mosely (R)	No Opp.	35.9	90,957	93,400 110,212
7	Torbert H. Macdonald* (D)	82.3	67.7	28,810	19,918 23,503
	Joan Aliberti (R)	37.3	32.3	25,274	25,213 29,751

639

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.15
8	Thomas P. O'Neil, Jr.*(D)	No Opp.	88.7	42,107	35,901	41,286
	John Powers (SW)	No Opp.	11.3	229	229	270
9	John Moakley (I)	No Opp.	43.2	144,867	157,566	180,701
	Louise Day Hicks*(D)	37.7	41.1	32,356	29,666	35,699
	Howard Miller (R)	51.4	14.2	58,240	58,240	66,976
10	Margaret M. Heckler*(R)	No Opp.	No Opp.	14,704	10,518	12,096
11	James A. Burke*(D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	15,957	15,971	18,367
12	Gerry E. Studds (D)	No Opp.	50.3	200,926	185,756	213,619
	William D. Weeks (R)	No Opp.	49.7	269,858	269,046	309,403
	MICHIGAN					
1	John Conyers*(D)	No Opp.	88.4	39,663	29,691	34,145
	Walter Girardot (R)	64.7	10.8	1,513	978	1,125
2	Marvin Esch*(R)	No Opp.	56.0	73,416	71,649	82,396
	Marvin Stempien (D)	32.1	43.3	53,141	55,292	63,586
3	Garry Brown*(R)	No Opp.	59.2	32,012	23,116	26,584
	James Brignall (D)	63.1	39.9	25,375	26,320	30,268
4	Edward Hutchinson*(R)	61.5	67.3	40,401	40,110	46,127
	Charles W. Jameson (D)	58.9	32.7	10,894	12,300	14,145
5	Gerald Ford*(R)	No Opp.	61.1	98,576	87,345	100,447
	Jean McKee (D)	43.1	37.7	10,223	8,796	10,115
6	Charles Chamberlain*(R)	59.2	50.6	53,757	52,136	59,956
	Robert Carr (D)	No Opp.	49.4	53,469	52,462	60,331

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.15
	MICHIGAN CONT'D					
7	Donald Riegle, Jr.*(R)	No Opp.	70.1%	$ 29,734	$ 23,892	27,476
	Eugene Mattison (D)	50.2%	29.9	1,200	1,200	1,380
8	James Harvey*(R)	No Opp.	59.3	53,534	50,546	58,128
	Jerome Hart (D)	74.0	39.4	27,517	27,517	31,645
9	Guy Vander Jagt* (R)	No Opp.	69.4	50,983	23,887	27,470
	Larry Olson (D)	No Opp.	29.5	4,635	4,636	5,331
10	Elford Cederberg*(R)	81.7	66.7	19,410	17,684	20,336
	Bennie Graves (D)	No Opp.	30.9	5,197	4,666	5,366
11	Philip Ruppe*(R)	No Opp.	69.4	30,854	27,045	31,102
	James McNamara (D)	63.1	29.8	308	526	605
12	James O'Hara*(D)	No Opp.	50.8	66,463	62,472	71,843
	David Serotkin (R)	55.8	49.2	44,075	43,619	50,162
13	Charles Diggs*(D)	No Opp.	85.6	3,791	2,566	2,951
	Leonard T. Edwards(R)	No Opp.	13.3	10	10	12
14	Lucien Nedzi*(D)	43.0	54.9	36,189	32,765	37,680
	Robert McGrath (R)	71.3	45.1	16,568	16,568	19,053
15	William Ford*(D)	61.9	65.8	57,399	42,352	48,705
	Ernest Fackler (R)	No Opp.	32.2	40	43	50
16	John Dingell*(D)	85.8	68.1	33,611	26,593	30,582
	William Kostron (R)	No Opp.	29.7	239	239	275

Cong. Dist.			Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	Expend. x 1.1
17	Martha Griffiths *(D)		No Opp.	66.8	31,027	22,506	24,756
	Ralph Judd		55.0	32.5	645	527	580
18	*Robert Huber (R)*		*63.3*	*52.6*	*69,240*	*66,001*	*72,601*
	Daniel Cooper (D)		*37.0*	*47.4*	*84,588*	*83,280*	*91,608*
19	William Broomfield *(R)		57.6	70.4	66,986	41,706	45,876
	George Montgomery (D)		No Opp.	28.6	9,769	9,566	10,523
	MINNESOTA						
1	Albert Quie *(R)		No Opp.	70.7	37,552	32,586	35,845
	Charles Thompson (D)		60.6	29.3	379	438	482
2	Ancher Nelsen *(R)		No Opp.	57.1	72,206	68,855	75,741
	Charles Turnbull (D)		No Opp.	42.9	26,612	28,883	31,771
3	Bill Frenzel *(R)		93.1	62.9	119,544	97,933	107,726
	Jim Bell (D)		No Opp.	31.3	37,338	38,775	42,653
4	Joseph Karth *(D)		No Opp.	72.4	59,862	50,094	55,103
	Steve Thompson (R)		No Opp.	27.6	3,926	3,926	4,319
5	Donald Fraser* (D)		No Opp.	65.8	97,654	93,628	103,001
	Allan Davisson (R)		72.8	24.4	9,399	9,399	10,339
6	John Zwach *(R)		No Opp.	51.0	110,133	87,233	95,956
	Richard Nolan (D)		No Opp.	49.0	95,943	97,481	107,229
7	Bob Bergland *(D)		No Opp.	59.0	135,451	92,871	102,158
	Jon Haaven (R)		No Opp.	41.0	92,625	90,524	99,576
8	John Blatnik *(D)		76.1	75.9	54,566	54,612	60,073
	Edward Johnson (R)		No Opp.	24.1	745	395	466

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project		Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	Expend. x 1.1
	MISSISSIPPI						
1	Jamie L. Whitten(D)		86.7%	No Opp.	$ 4,100	$ 4,100	4,835
2	*David R. Bowen (D)*	**	*57.0*	*61.9%*	*149,100*	*142,500*	*168,150*
	Carl Butler (R)		*No Opp.*	*34.7*	*80,759*	*80,449*	*94,930*
3	G.V. Montgomery* (D)		No Opp.	No Opp.	1,550	381	450
4	*Thad Cochran (R)*		*No Opp.*	*47.8*	*102,880*	*100,634*	*118,748*
	Ellis B. Bodron (D)	**	*50.8*	*44.0*	*100,108*	*100,128*	*118,151*
5	*Trent Lott (R)*		*70.7*	*55.3*	*119,837*	*119,130*	*140,614*
	Ben Stone (D)	**	*52.4*	*44.2*	*158,844*	*163,970*	*173,492*
	MISSOURI						
1	William Clay* (D)		75.8	64.0	31,619	17,480	20,626
	Richard Funsch (R)		No Opp.	36.0	59,335	59,672	70,413
2	James Symington* (D)		No Opp.	63.5	92,056	67,938	80,167
	John Cooper, Jr. (R)		55.3	36.5	35,533	30,298	35,752
3	Leonor Sullivan (D)		93.9	69.3	34,404	29,225	34,485
	Albert Holst, Sr. (R)		66.3	30.4	5,151	5,151	6,078
4	William Randall* (D)		No Opp.	57.4	33,324	24,531	28,947
	Raymond Barrows (R)		No Opp.	42.6	6,310	5,922	6,988
5	Richard Bolling* (D)		No Opp.	62.8	25,559	25,054	29,564
	Vernon Rice (R)		No Opp.	35.6	575	442	522

[000239]

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.13
	NEVADA					
1	David Towell (R)	41.6%	52.2%	$ 81,779	$ 83,106	98,065
	James Bilbray (D)	52.0	47.8	174,086	178,406	211,699
	NEW HAMPSHIRE					
1	Louis Wyman*(R)	No Opp.	72.9	33,210	32,945	38,575
	Chester Merrow (D)	59.2	27.1	2,786	3,122	3,654
	James Cleveland*(R)	No Opp.	67.9	24,678	23,479	27,705
	Charles Officer (D)	No Opp.	32.1	35,065	37,030	43,675
	NEW JERSEY					
1	John Hunt*(R)	No Opp.	52.5	22,921	23,837	28,128
	James Florio (D)	79.6	47.1	36,373	36,107	42,606
2	Charles Sandman*(R)	No Opp.	65.7	11,780	11,780	13,900
	John Rose (D)	No Opp.	34.3	5,958	5,341	6,302
3	James Howard*(D)	No Opp.	53.0	70,721	62,773	74,072
	William Dowd (R)	No Opp.	47.0	50,718	50,718	59,847
4	Frank Thompson*(D)	No Opp.	58.0	51,454	48,221	56,901
	Peter Garibaldi (R)	No Opp.	42.0	8,083	7,983	9,420
5	Peter Frelinghuysen* (R)	No Opp.	62.0	20,765	20,765	24,503
	Frederick Bohen (D)	63.5	38.0	55,641	54,888	64,768
6	Jerry Litton (D)	35.7	54.6	171,635	168,642	199,098
	Russell Sloan (R)	59.8	45.4	102,269	100,059	118,070
7	Gene Taylor (R)	49.0	63.7	121,572	97,197	114,713
	William Thomas (D)	78.1	36.3	10,335	10,864	12,820
8	Richard Ichord*(D)	No Opp.	62.1	54,508	33,779	39,859
	David Countie (R)	No Opp.	37.9	10,194	9,309	10,985
9	William Hungate*(D)	No Opp.	66.5	38,197	26,147	30,853
	Robert Prange (R)	60.3	33.5	7,719	7,719	9,108
10	Bill Burlison*(D)	76.0	64.3	35,841	14,730	17,381
	Marion Svendrowski (R)	No Opp.	35.7	293	3,065	3,617
	MONTANA					
1	Richard Shoop*(R)	90.0	53.7	72,742	65,224	76,964
	Arnold Olsen (D)	44.8	46.3	50,414	54,940	64,829
2	John Melcher*(D)	No Opp.	76.1	51,025	49,092	57,929
	Richard Forester (R)	No Opp.	23.9	10,475	10,475	12,361
	NEBRASKA					
1	Charles Thone*(R)	84.0	64.2	90,130	90,130	106,353
	Darrel E. Berg (D)	No Opp.	35.8	28,655	21,704	25,611
2	John Y. McCollister*(R)	No Opp.	63.9	81,645	74,569	87,991
	Patrick L. Cooney (D)	No Opp.	36.1	21,456	22,050	26,019
3	Dave Martin*(R)	No Opp.	69.6	43,435	11,687	13,791
	Warren D. Fitzgerald (D)	54.2	30.4	9,425	9,425	11,122

6	Edwin Forsythe*(R) Francis Brennan (D)	No Opp. 34.2	62.8 36.1	40,228 9,815	38,61[illegible] 45,653 9,811 11,577	
7	William Widnall*(R) Arthur Lesemann (D)	No Opp. No Opp.	58.0 39.9	33,936 31,020	30,567 34,049 30,102 35,620	
8	Robert Roe*(D) Walter Johnson (R)	No Opp. No Opp.	63.1 36.9	66,101 756	66,706 78,713 776 916	
9	Henry Helstoski*(D) Alfred Schiaffo (R)	No Opp. 74.8	55.8 44.2	44,643 59,790	55,244 65,188 60,812 71,758	
10	Peter Rodino*(D) Kenneth Miller (R)	57.4 No Opp.	79.7 20.3	113,169 1,122	90,115 106,336 770 909	
11	Joseph Minish*(D) Milton Waldor (R)	No Opp. No Opp.	57.5 39.7	85,554 46,326	68,709 81,077 55,185 65,118	
12	*Matthew Rinaldo (R)* *Jerry English (D)*	*No Opp.* *68.1*	*63.5* *36.1*	*130,232* *36,335*	*131,790 15,512* *32,839 38,750*	
13	*Joseph Maraziti (R)* *Helen Meyner (D)*	*49.7* *No Opp.*	*55.7* *42.9*	*83,872* *67,746*	*83,972 99,087* *65,573 77,376*	
14	Dominick Daniels*(D) Richard Bozzone (R) Edward Zampella (CAC)	55.6 70.9 No Opp.	61.2 34.3 3.1	53,286 2,871 7,923	53,286 62,877 6,320 7,458 7,923 9,349	
15	Edward Patten*(D) Fuller Brooks (R)	No Opp. No Opp.	52.3 47.7	27,605 51,333	27,605 32,574 51,081 60,276	

646

[000240]

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend. x 1.18
	NEW MEXICO				
1	Manuel J. Lujan*(R) J.E. Gallegos (D)	90.5% 35.1	55.7% 44.3	$ 210,173 127,386	$ 212,093 250,270 126,219 148,938
2	Harold Runnels*(D) George Presson (R)	No Opp. 55.2	72.2 27.6	99,198 14,491	91,784 108,305 14,810 17,476
	NEW YORK				
1	Otis Pike*(D) Joseph Boyd (R) Robert Gardiner (CON)	No Opp. No Opp. No Opp.	52.5 36.9 9.5	54,327 78,887 37,717	51,842 61,174 80,302 [illegible] 37,877 44,695
2	James Grover*(R) Fern C. Dennison(D)	No Opp. No Opp.	65.8 32.7	9,967 6,864	4,054 4,784 6,325 7,464
3	*Angelo D. Roncallo (R)* *Carter F. Bales (D)*	*No Opp.* *51.4*	*53.1* *37.6*	*89,312* *109,219*	*109,552 129,387* *112,455 132,697*
4	Norman F. Lent*(R) Elaine B. Horowitz (D)	No Opp. No Opp.	62.4 35.9	52,825 20,150	45,306 53,461 27,176 32,070
5	John W. Wydler*(R) Ferne M. Steckler (D)	No Opp. No Opp.	62.4 31.7	50,105 28,369	44,644 52,680 25,333 29,893
6	Lester L. Wolff*(D) John T. Gallagher (R)	No Opp. No Opp.	51.5 48.5	64,072 36,398	64,069 75,601 45,449 53,630
7	Joseph P. Addabbo*(D) John E. Hall (R)	64.2 No Opp.	75.0 20.6	24,128 1,201	22,487 26,535 1,540 1,817

647

8	Benjamin S. Rosenthal*(D)	No Opp.	64.7	18,892	18,739	20,112
	Frank A. La Pina (R)	No Opp.	35.3	6,279	6,279	7,467
9	James J. Delaney*(D)	55.4	93.4	56,173	56,396	66,545
10	Mario Biaggi*(D)	No Opp.	93.9	13,066	12,719	15,008
11	Frank J. Brasco*(D)	73.0	63.9	43,723	38,943	45,953
	Melvin Solomon (R)	52.6	31.3	-0-	-0-	
12	Shirley Chisholm*(D)	No Opp.	87.9	,800	4,796	5,659
	John M . Coleman (R)	No Opp.	9.7	-0-	-0-	
13	Bertram L. Podell*(D)	68.0	65.1	84,107	71,852	84,785
	Joseph P. Marcucci (R)	56.2	25.5	350	1,842	2,174
	Leonard M. Simon (LIB)	No Opp.	5.3	51,846	52,235	61,637
14	(1)John J. Rooney*(D)	54.2	53.9	117,855	110,054	129,864
	Allard K. Lowenstein (LIB)	45.8	28.1	281,028	285,475	336,861
	Francis S. Voyticky (R)	51.4	17.5	270	270	319
15	Hugh L. Carey*(D)	No Opp.	52.1	90,294	122,905	145,028
	John Gangemi (R)	No Opp.	43.0	49,519	49,296	58,169
16	*Elizabeth Holtzman (D)*	*44.5*	*65.6*	*84,724*	*104,318*	*123,075*
	Nicholas Bacchio (R)	*62.4*	*22.9*	-0-	-0-	
17	John Murphy*(D)	No Opp.	60.3	82,585	105,581	124,586
	Mario Delardino (R)	No Opp.	39.7	88,180	87,559	103,320
18	Edward Koch*(D)	No Opp.	69.9	69,295	69,295	81,768
	Jane Langley (R)	No Opp.	29.3	107,812	120,351	142,014
19	Charles Rangel*(D)	75.6	96.0	33,834	31,390	37,040
20	Bella Abzug*(D)	31.2	55.7	169,731	164,245	193,809
	Priscilla Ryan (LIB)	No Opp.	28.0	52,713	51,417	60,672
	Annette Levy (R)	No Opp.	11.8	2,360	2,360	2,785
	Harvey Michelman (COU)	No Opp.	4.1	5,274	5,261	6,208

1 Rooney and Lowenstein were both involved in a court ordered second Democratic primary.

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend. x 1.18
	NEW YORK CONT'D				
21	Herman Badillo*(D)	77.8%	86.9%	$ 52,487	$ 52,558 62,058
	Manuel Ramos (R)	22.2	11.4	26,950	26,950 31,801
22	Jonathan Bingham*(D)	55.5	76.5	127,376	126,138 148,943
	Charles Avarello (R)	No Opp.	23.5	16,460	16,416 19,371
23	Peter Peyser*(R)	No Opp.	50.4	173,528	154,567 182,389
	Richard Ottinger (D)	No Opp.	49.6	198,914	195,784 231,025
24	Ogden Reid*(D)	No Opp.	52.2	164,224	209,007 246,628
	Carl Vergari (R)	71.5	47.8	190,890	190,890 225,250
25	Hamilton Fish*(R)	No Opp.	71.7	27,072	23,208 27,385
	John Burns (D)	No Opp.	26.9	19,347	18,431 21,747
26	Benjamin Gilman (R)	57.9	4 8	100,623	112,729 133,020
	John Dow*(D)	No Opp.	39.3	68,184	52,197 61,593
	Yale Rapkin (I)	42.1	12.9	94,193	80,595 95,102
27	Howard W. Robison*(R)	No Opp.	62.2	14,998	14,853 17,527
	David H. Blazer (D)	No Opp.	29.8	1,746	2,585 3,050
28	Samuel Stratton*(D)	No Opp.	80.0	51,712	27,297 32,210
	John Ryan, Jr. (R)	No Opp.	20.0	1,299	1,308 1,543
29	Carleton J. King*(R)	No Opp.	69.9	24,555	17,567 20,729
	Harold B. Gordon (D)	No Opp.	30.1	2,849	2,849 3,362

30	Robert McEwen* (R)	85.4	66.0	12,261	9,861 11,662
	Ernest J. La Baff (D)	No Opp.	34.0	9,938	10,019 11,822
31	*Donald J. Mitchell (R)*	*33.3*	*51.0*	*82,811*	*81,740* [illegible]
	John Buckley (Lib)	*No Opp.*	*3.7*	*39,643*	*39,643* 46,777
	Robert Castle (D)	*No Opp.*	*33.1*	*91,881*	*91,881* 108,480
	Franklin Nichols (Amer.)	*No Opp.*	*6.2*	*18,358*	*18,358* 21,662
32	James Hanley*(D)	No Opp.	57.2	76,134	63,011 74,353
	Leonard Koldin (R)	No Opp.	42.8	66,937	75,175 88,707
33	*William Walsh (R)*	*No Opp.*	*71.4*	*22,816*	*34,795* 41,058
	Clarence Kadys (D)	*No Opp.*	*28.6*	*19,283*	*19,283* 22,754
34	Frank Horton*(R)	No Opp.	72.1	37,909	32,326 38,145
	Jack Rubens (D)	No Opp.	23.5	5,412	5,411 6,385
35	Barber Conable*(R)	No Opp.	67.9	21,239	18,907 22,308
	Terence Spencer (D)	No Opp.	28.4	7,473	6,753 7,968
36	Henry Smith*(R)	No Opp.	57.3	72,547	72,670 85,760
	Richard McCarthy (D)	No Opp.	42.7	61,774	61,774 72,893
37	Thaddeus Dulski* (D)	No Opp.	72.2	13,206	8,018 9,461
	William McLaughlin (R)	No Opp.	27.8	3,316	3,316 3,913
38	Jack Kemp*(R)	No Opp.	73.2	93,717	89,617 105,748
	Anthony La Russo (D)	No Opp.	26.8	15,200	20,342 24,004
39	James Hastings*(R)	No Opp.	71.9	24,668	17,794 20,997
	Wilbur White (D)	No Opp.	28.1	450	1,663 1,962

650

[000242]

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend. x 1.18
	NORTH CAROLINA				
1	Walter B. Jones*(D)	No Opp.	68.8%	$ 19,959	$ 8,727 10,298
	Gordon J. Bonner (R)	53.0%	31.2	4,394	17,057 20,127
2	L.H. Fountain*(D)	58.8	71.6	44,177	40,630 47,943
	Erick P. Little (R)	No Opp.	28.4	19,002	19,002 22,422
3	David N. Henderson*(D)	79.3	No Opp.	7,590	4,258 5,024
4	*Ike F. Andrews (D)* **	*52.1*	*50.4*	*121,328*	*110,947* 130,917
	Jack R. Hawke (R)	*No Opp.*	*49.6*	*77,678*	*77,573* 91,536
5	Wilmer Mizell*(R)	No Opp.	64.8	49,114	37,264 43,972
	Brooks Hays (D)	No Opp.	35.2	34,570	34,358 40,542
6	Richardson Preyer*(D)	No Opp.	93.9	9,642	8,657 10,215
7	*Charles Rose III (D)* **	*55.6*	*60.4*	*91,298*	*86,933* 102,581
	Jerry Scott (R)	*50.2*	*38.7*	*11,177*	*12,402* 14,634
8	Earl Ruth*(R)	No Opp.	60.2	41,016	29,110 34,350
	Richard Clark (D)	No Opp.	39.8	51,809	51,809 61,135
9	*James Martin (R)*	*80.4*	*58.9*	*135,674*	*149,809* 176,417
	James Beatty (D)	*84.1*	*41.1*	*71,856*	*63,107* 74,466
10	James T. Broyhill*(R)	No Opp.	72.5	40,568	34,251 40,416
	Paul Beck (D)	No Opp.	27.5	360	357 421
11	Roy Taylor*(D)	No Opp.	59.6	22,174	21,721 25,631
	Jesse Ledbetter (R)	No Opp.	40.4	11,085	12,066 14,238

651

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[000243]

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.18
	NORTH DAKOTA					
1	Mark Andrews *(R)	No Opp.	72.7	58,227	58,196	68,671
	Richard Ista (D)	No Opp.	27.1	18,935	18,935	22,343
	OHIO					
1	William Keating *(R)	No Opp.	70.3	76,450	71,648	84,781
	Karl Heiser (D)	No Opp.	29.7	12,594	13,453	15,875
2	Donald Clancy *(R)	88.8	62.8	45,923	27,034	31,900
	Penny Manes (D)	No Opp.	37.2	8,859	8,859	10,454
3	Charles Whalen *(R)	No Opp.	76.2	22,178	17,973	21,208
	John Lelak (D)	No Opp.	23.8	3,285	3,930	4,637
4	*Tennyson Guyer (R)*	*72.3*	*62.7*	*40,462*	*40,013*	*47,215*
	Dimitri Nicholas (D)	*32.1*	*37.3*	*38,412*	*38,412*	*45,326*
5	Delbert Latta *(R)	No Opp.	72.7	31,796	24,016	28,339
	Bruce Edwards (D)	No Opp.	27.3	4,132	3,645	4,301
6	William Harsha *(R)	No Opp.	No Opp.	2,500	1,665	1,965
7	Clarence Brown *(R)	No Opp.	73.3	51,111	31,534	37,210
	Dorothy Franke (D)	No Opp.	26.7	2,652	2,838	3,349
8	Walter Powell *(R)	67.0	52.2	67,814	66,098	77,996
	James Ruppert (D)	81.0	47.8	70,813	73,706	86,973
9	Thomas Ashley *(D)	89.0	69.1	27,781	17,416	20,551
	Joseph Richards (R)	46.9	30.9	20,019	20,019	23,622
	OHIO CONT'D					
10	Clarence Miller *(R)	86.9%	73.2%	$ 40,542	$ 26,983	31,840
	Robert Wheeley (D)	59.2	26.8	4,251	5,452	6,433
11	William Stanton *(R)	No Opp.	68.2	21,743	19,853	23,427
	Dennis Callahan (D)	50.5	31.8	23,256	22,822	26,930
12	Samuel Devine *(R)	No Opp.	56.1	67,862	51,930	61,277
	James Goodrich (D)	No Opp.	43.9	105,987	125,145	147,671
13	Charles Mosher *(R)	80.6	68.1	19,502	13,218	15,597
	John Ryan (D)	No Opp.	31.9	5,593	5,593	6,600
14	John Seiberling *(D)	82.3	74.4	27,649	26,325	31,064
	Norman Holt (R)	77.5	25.6	4,779	6,391	7,541
15	Chalmers Wylie *(R)	No Opp.	65.8	65,945	53,091	62,647
	Manly McGee (D)	50.1	31.5	20,475	23,398	27,610
16	*Ralph Regula (R)*	*85.7*	*57.3*	*81,468*	*81,383*	*96,032*
	Virgil Musser (D)	*57.6*	*42.7*	*24,800*	*23,328*	*27,527*
17	John Ashbrook *(R)	74.1	57.4	58,173	58,173	68,644
	Raymond Beck (D)	45.8	38.7	13,062	13,062	15,413
18	Wayne Hays *(D)	84.4	70.2	34,318	20,009	23,611
	Robert Stewart (R)	No Opp.	29.8	4,221	3,300	3,894
19	Charles Carney *(D)	57.1	64.0	69,148	54,037	63,764
	Norman Parr (R)	No Opp.	36.0	21,306	21,307	25,142

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.12
20	James Stanton*(D)	76.0	84.3	44,792	44,272	52,341
	Thomas Vilt (R)	No Opp.	11.9	8,157	8,157	9,625
21	Louis Stokes*(D)	82.5	81.1	17,718	17,718	20,907
	James Johnson (R)	No Opp.	11.3	6,992	7,531	8,887
22	Charles A. Vanik*(D)	No Opp.	63.9	36,067	36,067	42,559
	Donald Gropp (R)	No Opp.	32.6	114,646	120,430	142,107
23	William Minshall*(R)	87.1	49.4	133,233	127,212	150,110
	Dennis Kucinich (D)	51.0	47.3	28,096	28,096	33,153
	OKLAHOMA					
1	James R. Jones (D)	60.4	54.5	63,405	64,830	76,499
	James Hewgley (R)	50.8	43.7	179,986	179,986	212,383
2	Clem McSpadden (D)	62.3	71.1	93,654	93,103	109,862
	Emery Toliver (R)	No Opp.	28.9	7,787	7,787	9,189
3	Carl Albert*(D)	84.7	93.4	39,170	7,275	8,585
4	Tom Steed*(D)	87.5	71.3	17,141	6,609	7,799
	William E. Crozier (R)	No Opp.	28.7	3,310	3,622	4,274
5	John Jarman*(D)	65.0	60.4	66,351	27,534	32,490
	Llewellyn Keller (R)	51.0	39.6	8,751	7,798	9,202
6	John N. Camp* (R)	No Opp.	72.7	33,492	33,492	39,521
	William Patrick Schmitt (D)	No Opp.	27.3	5,310	5,310	6,266

654

[000244]

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.12
	OREGON					
1	Wendall Wyatt* (R)	No Opp.	68.6%	$ 75,093	$ 75,093	88,610
	Ralph Bunch (D)	66.9%	31.4	6,871	6,810	8,036
2	Al Ullman* (D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	61,106	13,307	15,702
3	Edith Green* (D)	No Opp.	62.4	41,726	41,031	48,417
	Michael Walsh (R)	No Opp.	37.5	58,080	58,403	68,916
4	John Dellenback* (R)	78.7	62.5	54,659	49,711	58,659
	Charles Porter (D)	33.1	37.4	19,406	20,635	24,349
	PENNSYLVANIA					
1	William Barrett* (D)	No Opp.	66.1	16,261	16,261	19,188
	Gus Pedicone (R)	No Opp.	33.2	44,574	43,547	51,385
2	Robert Nix* (D)	47.0	70.1	7,837	4,073	4,806
	Frederick Bryant (R)	71.4	29.9	5,865	4,936	5,825
3	William Green* (D)	57.2	63.3	66,088	65,107	76,826
	Alfred Marroletti (P)	No Opp.	36.2	17,813	16,938	19,987
	Anthony Monteiro (Com)	No Opp.	0.5	13,106	12,861	15,176
4	Joshua Eilberg* (D)	No Opp.	55.9	70,028	61,471	72,536
	William Pfender (R)	No Opp.	44.1	101,820	102,923	121,449
5	John Ware* (R)	49.5	64.7	29,506	26,200	30,916
	Brower Yerger (D)	52.3	35.3	6,230	6,841	8,072

655

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	Expend. x 1.18
6	Gus Yatron* (D)	No Opp.	64.5	60,979	56,237	66,359
	Eugene Rubler (R)	63.8	34.6	17,277	16,623	19,615
7	Lawrence Williams* (R)	No Opp.	60.6	81,955	73,023	86,167
	Stuart Bowie (D)	No Opp.	39.4	13,881	11,879	14,017
8	Edward Biester* (R)	80.3	64.4	17,862	17,345	20,467
	Alan Williams (D)	45.3	35.6	25,236	24,219	28,578
9	E.G. Shuster (R)	61.3	61.8	64,231	73,852	87,145
	Earl Collins (D)	No Opp.	38.2	17,461	17,815	21,022
10	Joseph McDade* (R)	No Opp.	73.6	26,943	24,934	29,422
	Stanley Coveleskie (D)	67.3	26.4	4,049	6,281	7,412
11	Daniel Flood* (D)	88.0	68.3	28,688	26,393	31,144
	Donald Ayers (R)	55.6	31.7	10,115	10,113	11,933
12	John Saylor* (R)	72.1	68.1	38,839	34,992	41,291
	Joseph Murphy (D)	No Opp.	31.9	20	95	112
13	Lawrence Coughlin* (R)	No Opp.	66.6	36,941	36,423	42,979
	Katherine Camp (D)	59.9	33.4	35,301	34 263	40,430
14	William Moorhead* (D)	85.7	59.3	38,313	36,205	42,722
	Roland Catarinella (R)	No Opp.	40.4	82,409	78,400	92,512
15	Fred Rooney* (D)	86.0	60.8	34,858	29,315	34,592
	Wardell Steigerwalt (R)	No Opp.	39.2	2,170	2,170	2,561
16	Edwin Eshleman* (R)	No Opp.	73.5	15,433	14,041	16,568
	Shirley Garrett (D)	No Opp.	26.5	1,305	2,242	2,646

959

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	Expend. x 1.18
	PENNSYLVANIA CONT'D					
17	Herman Schneebeli*(R)	No Opp.	72.2%	$ 59,376	$ 19,311	22,787
	Donald Rippon (D)	No Opp.	26.5	2,230	2,386	2,815
18	H. John Heinz* (R)	No Opp.	72.8	109,700	103,542	122,180
	Douglas Walgren (D)	No Opp.	27.2	3,320	3,123	3,685
19	George Goodling*(R)	60.0%	57.5	43,862	37,168	43,858
	Richard Noll (D)	No Opp.	41.2	13,159	13,159	15,528
20	Joseph Gaydos*(D)	No Opp.	61.5	42,522	44,379	52,367
	William Hunt (R)	No Opp.	38.5	64,701	63,843	75,335
21	John Dent*(D)	64.5	62.0	46,093	32,024	37,788
	Thomas Young (R)	No Opp.	38.0	325	325	384
22	Thomas Morgan*(D)	72.5	60.8	44,340	32,157	37,945
	James Montgomery (R)	55.6	39.2	807	807	952
23	Albert Johnson*(R)	61.4	56.5	28,907	31,582	37,267
	Ernest Kassab (D)	56.9	43.5	53,656	66,948	79,019
24	Joseph Vigorito*(D)	86.2	68.8	13,692	13,504	15,935
	Alvin Levenhagen (R)	No Opp.	31.2	11,856	10,479	12,365
25	Frank Clark*(D)	No Opp.	55.8	20,350	26,444	31,204
	Gary Myers (R)	64.9	44.2	6,963	8,910	10,514

957

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend. x 1.18
	RHODE ISLAND				
1	Fernand St. Germain*(D)	No Opp.	62.3	51,186	48,071 56,724
	John Feeley (R)	No Opp.	34.7	20,371	20,371 24,038
2	Robert Tiernan*(D)	No Opp.	63.1	42,034	47,418 55,953
	Donald Ryan (R)	No Opp.	36.9	6,000	5,012 5,914
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
1	Mendel Davis*(D)	72.5	54.5	86,009	84,377 99,565
	Sidi Limehouse (R)	No Opp.	45.5	101,225	100,902 119,064
2	Floyd Spence*(R)	No Opp.	No Opp.	20,676	5,936 7,004
3	W. J. Bryan Dorn * (D)	No Opp.	75.2	25,649	24,797 29,260
	Roy Ethridge (R)	No Opp.	24.8	5,780	5,849 6,902
4	James Mann*(D)	No Opp.	66.1	35,515	35,475 41,861
	Wayne Whatley (R)	No Opp.	33.9	13,913	14,322 16,900
5	Tom Gettys*(D)	No Opp.	60.9	26,655	22,640 26,715
	Leonard Phillips (R)	No Opp.	39.1	14,468	14,349 16,932
6	*Edward Young (R)*	*No Opp.*	*54.4*	*90,257*	*93,590 110,436*
	John Jenrette (D) **	*50.6*	*45.6*	*94,019*	*94,019 110,942*
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
1	Frank Denholm*(D)	No Opp.	60.5	41,062	40,445 47,725
	John Vickerman (R)	No Opp.	39.5	53,017	52,508 62,054
2	*James Abdnor (R)*	*64.4*	*54.9*	*96,252*	*96,252 113,578*
	Patrick Mc Keever (D)	*No Opp.*	*45.1*	*62,271*	*62,235 73,437*

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend. x 1.18
	TENNESSEE				
1	James Quillen*(R)	No Opp.	79.4%	$ 17,065	$ 3,799 4,483
	Bernard Cantor (D)	No Opp.	20.6	5,807	5,807 6,852
2	John Duncan*(R)	No Opp.	No Opp.	8,928	9,585 11,310
3	Lamar Baker*(R)	No Opp.	55.2	78,502	77,199 91,095
	Howard Sompayrac (D)	No Opp.	41.9	40,856	39,974 47,169
4	Joe L. Evins*(D)	No Opp.	81.1	12,455	11,520 13,594
	Billy Joe Finney (R)	No Opp.	18.9	500	1,738 2,051
5	Richard Fulton*(D)	73.2%	62.6	80,219	83,697 98,762
	Alfred T. Adams, Jr.(R)	72.9	36.8	99,493	97,482 115,029
6	Robin L. Beard (R)	76.8	55.3	149,697	151,605 178,894
	William R. Anderson*(D)	60.7	43.1	98,087	105,022 123,926
7	Ed Jones*(D)	No Opp.	70.5	48,600	81,789 96,511
	Stockton Adkins (R)	No Opp.	29.5	20,307	20,136 23,760
8	Dan Kuykendall* (R)	No Opp.	55.4	127,913	119,023 140,447
	J.O. Patterson, Jr. (D)	74.9	44.1	83,433	67,444 79,584
	TEXAS				
1	Wright Patman*(D)	57.5	No Opp.	22,025	26,423 31,179
2	*Charles Wilson (D)*	*63.0*	*73.8*	*87,836*	*93,5[illegible] 110,[illegible]*
	Charles Brightwell (R)	*65.2*	*26.2*	*2,772*	*2,764 3,262*

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project		Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend.	x 1.18
	TEXAS CONT'D						
16	Richard White* (D)		No Opp.	No Opp.	$ 5,197	$ 2,009	2,371
17	Omar Burleson* (D)		No Opp.	No Opp.	17,062	5,341	6,302
18	*Barbara Jordan (D)*		*80.4%*	*80.6%*	*61,886*	*57,065*	*67,337*
	Paul Merritt (R)		*79.0*	*18.2*	*3,875*	*3,257*	*3,843*
19	George Mahon* (D)		No Opp.	No Opp.	3,288	4,358	5,142
20	Henry Gonzalez* (D)		No Opp.	96.9	1,612	1,012	1,194
	Steve Wattenmaker (SW)		No Opp.	3.1	-0-	-0-	
21	O.C. Fisher* (D)		No Opp.	56.8	26,198	18,463	21,786
	Doug Harlan (R)		60.3	43.2	34,422	32,810	38,716
22	Bob Casey* (D)		69.5	70.2	97,311	93,322	110,120
	Jim Griffin (R)		73.0	29.0	3,122	3,108	3,667
23	Abraham Kazen, Jr.* (D)		75.0	No Opp.	17,678	8,354	9,858
24	*Dale Milford (D)*	**	*54.2*	*65.1*	*94,410*	*92,363*	*109,028*
	Courtney Roberts (R)	**	*72.3*	*34.9*	*33,247*	*33,247*	*39,231*
	UTAH						
1	Gunn McKay* (D)		No Opp.	55.4	52,647	52,320	61,738
	Robert Wolthuis (R)		53.0	42.0	61,669	62,472	73,717

2 Contributions for W.R. Poage exclude over $10,000 in returned contributions.

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend. x 1.18
	VERMONT				
1	Richard Mallary* (R)	No Opp.	65.0	11,289	4,085 4,820
	William Meyer (D)	No Opp.	35.0	5,122	5,193 6,128
	VIRGINIA				
1	Thomas N. Downing* (D)	No Opp.	78.1	47,601	48,409 57,123
	Kenneth Wells (R)	No Opp.	21.9	34,376	35,264 41,612
2	William G. Whitehurst* (R)	No Opp.	73.4	52,102	45,864 54,120
	Charles L. Burlage (D)	No Opp.	26.6	42,790	42,790 50,492
3	David Satterfield* (D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	3,476	-0-
4	Robert W. Daniel, Jr. (R)	No Opp.	47.1	59,237	58,140 68,725
	Robert E. Gibson (D)	No Opp.	37.5	33,902	40,546 47,844
5	W.C. Daniel, Jr.* (D)	No Opp.	No Opp.	3,892	3,429 4,046
6	Caldwell Butler (R)	No Opp.	54.6	104,127	116,363 137,308
	Willie M. Anderson (D)	No Opp.	39.2	49,578	49,078 57,912
7	Kenneth Robinson* (R)	No Opp.	66.2	108,336	73,177 87,057
	Murat Williams (D)	No Opp.	33.8	44,735	44,972 53,067
8	Stanford E. Parris (R)	63.3	44.4	111,817	109,271 128,940
	Robert F. Horan, Jr. (D)	42.2	37.8	53,670	53,129 62,692
	William Durland (I)	No Opp.	13.7	35,777	41,176 48,587
	Robert Harris (I)	No Opp.	4.1	18,885	18,956 22,368
9	William C. Wampler* (R)	No Opp.	71.9	35,304	23,937 28,246
	Zane Dale Christian (D)	No Opp.	26.4	15,708	29,534 34,850

Cong. Dist.	Source: Common Cause Campaign Monitoring Project	Primary Vote %	General Election Vote %	Contrib.	Expend. x 1.18
	VIRGINIA CONT'D				
10	Joel T. Broyhill* (R)	No Opp.	56.3%	$ 185,237	$ 141,290 166,722
	Harold Miller (D)	No Opp.	43.7	93,087	91,501 107,971
	WASHINGTON				
1	Joel Pritchard (R)	75.8%	50.3	112,631	112,933 133,261
	John Hempelmann (D)	71.2	49.1	84,544	84,136 99,280
2	Lloyd Meeds* (D)	No Opp.	60.5	53,655	42,062 49,633
	Bill Reams (R)	63.3	39.5	54,717	54,717 64,566
3	Julia Hansen* (D)	63.5	66.3	61,016	43,351 51,154
	R.C. McConkey (R)	61.8	33.7	4,318	4,309 5,085
4	Mike McCormack* (D)	No Opp.	52.1	70,543	66,130 78,033
	Stewart Bledsoe (R)	56.6	47.9	141,560	141,560 167,041
5	Thomas Foley* (D)	No Opp.	81.3	42,890	27,476 32,422
	Clarice Privette (R)	No Opp.	18.7	500	500 590
6	Floyd Hicks* (D)	No Opp.	72.1	33,854	7,770 9,169
	Thomas Lowry (R)	No Opp.	27.9	23,995	23,888 28,188
7	Brock Adams* (D)	No Opp.	85.4	77,640	36,058 42,548
	J.J. Freeman (R)	No Opp.	12.1	512	512 604
	WEST VIRGINIA				
1	Robert Mollohan* (D)	No Opp.	69.4	30,836	29,619 34,950
	George Kapnicky (R)	No Opp.	30.6	2,387	2,392 2,823

2	Harley Staggers* (D)	73.0	70.0	29,520	29,520
	David Dix (R)	No Opp.	30.0	3,847	3,897
3	John Slack* (D)	No Opp.	63.7	26,018	12,019
	David Higgins (R)	No Opp.	36.3	4,356	4,358
4	Ken Hechler* (D)	52.2	61.0	21,976	20,24[illegible]
	Joe Neal (R)	No Opp.	39.0	36,398	36,362
	WISCONSIN				
1	Les Aspin* (D)	91.4	64.4	82,852	70,326
	Merril Stalbaum (R)	43.1	34.9	12,062	12,062
2	Robert Kastenmeier* (D)	No Opp.	68.2	38,861	24,997
	Michael Kelly (R)	58.5	31.4	23,080	23,080
3	Vernon Thomson* (R)	79.6	54.7	76,866	76,853
	Walter Thoresen (D)	39.0	44.6	49,202	49,328
4	Clement Zablocki* (D)	83.2	75.7	16,782	15,871
	Philip Mrozinski (R)	No Opp.	22.8	375	375
5	Henry Reuss* (D)	No Opp.	77.3	14,829	12,613
	Frederick Van Hecke (R)	No Opp.	20.4	4,730	4,743
6	William Steiger* (R)	No Opp.	65.8	34,708	33,599
	James Adams (D)	No Opp.	32.0	6,546	6,528
7	David Obey* (D)	No Opp.	62.8	74,427	64,054
	Alvin O'Konski* (R)	55.0	37.2	42,480	42,772
8	*Harold Froehlich (R)*	*38.1*	*50.4*	*85,759*	*76,640*
	Robert Cornell (D)	*72.9*	*48.6*	*34,413*	*28,662*
9	Glenn Davis* (R)	58.6	61.4	72,879	59,737
	Ralph Fine (D)	No Opp.	36.7	6,579	6,579
	WYOMING				
1	Teno Roncalio* (D)	No Opp.	51.7	$ 65,646	$ 50,548

[000249]

6. The computer print-out, supplied by Common Cause, reflecting individual contributions (including loans) in excess of $500 by candidates for the 1974 Congressional campaigns, in response to plaintiffs' request for production of documents is hereby adopted and incorporated herein by reference as Exhibit C. This Exhibit will be furnished to this court by agreement with defendants and intervening defendants at a later date. Defendants and intervening defendants have requested that this document remain under seal; plaintiffs have no present objection to this request.

7. The following is a list of loans received and repaid by 1974 Congressional candidates:

LOANS RECEIVED AND REPAID

1974 U. S. Senate Campaigns

State	Candidate	Amount of Loans received & repaid
AK	cC. R. Lewis	1,400
AZ	cJ. Marshall	5,000
AR	-J. [illegible]. Jones	4,175
CO	*IG. W. Hart	8,959
CT	cJ. H. Brannen	750
FL	-J. M. Eckerd	96,050
IL	cI. Flory	500
IL	*+A. E. Stevenson	5,000
IA	-D. M. Stanley	12,000
KY	*I W. H. Ford	20,000
LA	*+ R. B. Long	75,000
MO	c T. B. Curtis	6,000
NV	*o P. Laxalt	57,500
NV	- H. Reid	[illegible] 42,200
NY	*+ J. K. Javits	5,000
NC	o R. B. Morgan	213,234
OH	o J. H. Glenn	78,665
OH	- R. J. Perk	12,000
PA	c Flaherty	6,887
SD	*+ G. S. McGovern	75,000
SD	c L. K. Thorsness	[illegible]0 5,900
VT	- R. W. Mallary	6,000
WI	c T. E. Petri	180
WA	c J. Metcalf	5,000

[000251]

LOANS RECEIVED AND REPAID

1974 House Campaigns

State-District		Candidate	Amount of Loan received & repaid
AK-00	c	W. L. Hensley	9,510
AZ-01	c	P. M. Fullinwider	4,000
AZ-03	c	L. P. Bosch	3,500
AZ-04	c	B. T. Brown	7,436
AR-03	c	B. Clinton	10,000
CA-05	c	T. Caylor	250
CA-08	*+	R. V. Dellums	4,000
	c	J. Redden	1,010
CA-09	c	E. Adams	6,015
	*I	F. H. Stark	18,860
CA-13	o	N. Y. Mineta	400
CA-19	*I	J. D. Lagomarsino	8,000
CA-20	c	A. Mathews	3,000
CA-22	c	R. R. Hallin	11,700
CA-23	c	J. E. Roberts	1,900
CA-24	o	H. A. Waxman	6,379
CA-29	No+	A. F. Hawkins	3,000
CA-31	c	N. A. Hodges	1,050
CA-35	*I	J. Lloyd	3,100
CA-36	c	J. B. Osgood	1,300
CA-37	c	B. R. Vincent	2,425
CA-38	o	J. M. Patterson	12,851

899

CA-38	-	D. Rehmann	18,931
CA-39	c	W. E. Farris	350
CA-43	c	B. Bandes	796
CO-01	c	F. K. Southworth	10,000
CO-04	c	J. S. Carroll	10,000
CT-01	c	F. MacBuckley	1,705
CT-02	o	C. J. Dodd	5,000
CT-06	o	A. J. Moffett	15,000
DE-00	c	J. R. Soles	5,386
GA-01	*+	R. B. Ginn	4,500
GA-03	*+	J. Brinkley	4,000
GA-04	+L	B. B. Blackburn	14,500
GA-04	*I	E. H. Levitas	5,000
GA-06	c	N. L. Gingrich	1,088
GA-07	-	J. Q. Collins, Jr.	2,300
HI-02	c	C. W. Coray	2,500
ID-01	c	J. R. Cox	15,089
IL-04	c	R. A. Rodger	6,080
IL-06	o	H. J. Hyde	4,500
IL-13	c	S. W. Beltham	2,289
IL-15	-	C. D. Carlson	5,000
IL-20	c	P. F. Mack	1,510
IL-21	*+	E. R. Madigan	3,600
IL-24	-	V. Oshel	6,000
IL-24	o	P. Simon	13,500
IN-06	*+	D. W. Evans ✓	5,000
IN-07	c	E. C. Tipton	3,118
IN-08	*I	F. H. Hayes	500
IN-08	+L	R. H. Zion	15,000

899

[000252]

LOANS RECEIVED AND REPAID

1974 House Campaigns

State-District		Candidate	Amount of Loan received & repaid
IN-09	*+	L. H. Hamilton	150
IA-01	*+	E. D. Mezvinsky	3,300
IA-02	-	T. Riley	2,500
IA-02	o	M. Blouin	19,400
IA-03	-	S. Rapp	3,000
IA-04	c	C. H. Dick, Jr.	3,000
IA-05	*I	T. Harkin	1,200
KS-02	o	M. E. Keys	4,700
KS-02	-	J. C. Peterson	18,416
KS-03	c	S. J. Wells	13,171
ME-01	*I	D. F. Emery	4,000
MD-01	*+	R. E. Bauman	3,000
MD-08	c	S. Kramer	3,000
MA-03	-	D. J. Rowe	8,000
MA-04	*+	R. F. Drinan	1,985
MA-10	c	B. F. Monahan	3,125
MI-02	c	J. S. Reuther	2,370
MI-03	c	P. H. Todd	2,000
MI-05	c	P. G. Goebel, Jr.	1,754
MI-06	o	R. M. Carr	4,610
MI-18	+L	R. J. Huber	7,428

MI-18	*I	J. J. Blanchard	6,000
MI-19	c	G. F. Montgomery	720
MN-01	c	U. Scott	900
MN-02	-	S. G. Babcock	925
MN-03	c	R. E. Riggs	860
MN-06	-	J. Grunseth	10,000
MN-06	o	R. Nolan	4,000
MN-08	o	J. L. Oberstar	1,139
MS-02	*+	D. R. Bowen	6,000
MS-04	c	K. L. Dean	800
MO-02	c	H. C. Ohlendorf	5,000
MO-09	c	M. R. Bischof, Jr.	1,500
MT-01	*I	M. S. Baucus	5,800
NB-02	c	C. D. Lynch	7,000
NH-01	-	D. A. Banks	17,500
NH-01	o	N. E. D'Amours	4,950
NJ-01	*I	J. J. Florio	3,000
NJ-02	*I	W. J. Hughes	2,000
NJ-02	+L	C. W. Sandman	10,000
NJ-05	-	F. M. Bohen	2,250
NJ-05	o	M. Fenwick	5,000
NJ-05	-	L. F. Newton	350
NJ-09	c	H. A. Pareti	5,000
NJ-13	*I	H. S. Meyner	3,190
NJ-15	c	E. J. Hammesfahn	136
NM-01	c	R. A. Mondragon	7,466
NY-03	+L	A. D. Roncallo	4,500
NY-04	c	F. Ornstein	300
NY-05	c	A. K. Lowenstein	9,600
NY-05	*+	J. W. Wydler	10,000

[000253]

LOANS RECEIVED AND REPAID

1974 House Campaigns

State-District	Candidate	Amount of Loan received & repaid
NY-08	*+ B. S. Rosenthal	700
NY-11	o J. H. Scheuer	36,000
NY-12	*+ S. Chisholm	1,600
NY-13	o S. J. Solarz	1,500
NY-14	- D. H. Elliot	6,500
NY-15	- A. D. Canade	5,000
NY-19	*+ C. B. Rangel	482
NY-26	c J. G. Dow	1,729
NY-32	c W. E. Bush	842
NY-33	c R. H. Bockman	258
NY-34	c I. L. Gossin	2,000
NY-35	c M. J. Costanza	3,000
NY-36	o J. J. LaFalce	5,000
NY-37	- J. R. Bala	1,400
NC-04	*+ Ike Andrews	2,500
NC-06	*+ R. Preyer	6,500
NC-06	c R. S. Ritchie	1,000
NC-07	No+ C. G. Ross III	6,000
NC-09	*+ J. G. Martin	2,000
NC-09	c M. Short	1,000
OH-01	+L T. A. Luken	5,000

672

OH-02	c E. W. Wolterman	250
OH-06	c L. A. Wood	1,000
OH-08	o T. N. Kindness	6,500
OH-09	c C. S. Finkbeiner	5,500
OH-12	c F. Ryan	2,000
OH-13	c F. M. Ritenauer	500
OK-02	- R. F. Keen	250
OK-02	o T. M. Risenhoover	79,750
OR-01	o L. AuCoin	10,250
OR-03	o R. B. Duncan	7,400
OR-03	- J. Peacentini	22,200
PA-07	- S. J. McEwen	25,000
PA-08	c W. B. Moyer	3,193
PA-12	c H. M. Fox	300
PA-12	*+ J. P. Murtha	8,500
PA-16	c M. J. Minney	800
PA-18	*+ H. J. Heinz III	15,000
PA-19	- A. L. Berger	5,000
PA-23	c Y. Mast	1,454
SC-02	c M. J. Peny	4,530
SD-01	*I L. Pressler	1,875
SD-02	c J. M. Wieland	5,000
TN-03	+L E. L. Baker	5,000
TN-03	*I M. Lloyd	10,000
TN-08	*I H. E. Ford	5,000
TX-05	*+ A. W. Steelman	185
TX-12	c J. S. Garvey	16,500
TX-13	+L R. D. Price	74,000
TX-14	No+ J. Young	500
TX-21	o R. Krueger	[illegible] 31,000

673

[000254]

LOANS RECEIVED AND REPAID

1974 House Campaigns

State-District		Candidate	Amount of Loan received & repaid
UT-01	c	R. W. Inkley	387
VT-00	-	F. J. Cain	7,500
VA-02	c	R. R. Richards	260
VA-04	c	L. E. Schlitz	4,500
VA-09	*+	W. C. Wampler	5,000
WA-03	o	D. Bonker	6,900
WA-03	-	L. A. Kramer	11,000
WI-03	*I	A. Baldus	1,500
WI-09	-	L. S. Adelman	500
WV-03	c	W. L. Larcamp	300
WV-01	c	J. A. Laurita	7,700
WY-00	c	T. F. Stroock	9,500

Code

c - Challenger who lost to incumbent

*I - Challenger who beat incumbent

*+ - Incumbent who won

+L - Incumbent who lost

o - Open Election win

- - Open Election loss

No+ - Incumbent with no opposition

[000255]

8. The following is a chart of 1974 Senate races in which challengers to incumbents received 45 percent or more of the vote. "Overage" means amounts received in contributions (including loans) in excess of $1,000 per individual and in excess of $5,000 per political committee, but excluding any such excess received prior to September 1, 1973.

[000256]

1974 SENATE RACES

	Percent of Vote	Overage
Indiana		
* Birch Bayh	50.7	105,231
Richard Cugar	46.4	39,911
Kansas		
* Robert Dole	50.9	62,581
William R. Roy	49.1	12,577
North Dakota		
* Milton R. Young	48.4	6,000
Guy	48.3	9,500

Oklahoma		
* Bellmon	49.4	27,600
Edmondson	48.9	-0-
Pennsylvania		
* Schweiker	53.0	19,536
Flaherty	45.9	11,200
South Dakota		
* McGovern	53.0	5,000
Thorsness	47.0	22,207

9. The following is a chart of 1974 House races in which challengers to incumbents received 45 percent or more of the vote. "Overage" has the same meaning as stated in No. 8 hereof.

1974 HOUSE RACES

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		Alaska		
	1	*D. Young	53.8	6,370
		W. Hensley	46.2	3,650
		Arizona		
	3	*S. Steiger	51.1	---
		P. Bosch	48.9	3,000
		Arkansas		
	3	*J. P. Hammerschmidt	51.8	---
		B. Clinton	48.2	5,100
		California		
	16	*B. Talcott	49.2	2,000
		J. Camacho	47.8	1,000
W	17	J. Krebs	51.9	---
		*R. Mathis	48.1	1,000
	18	*W. Ketchum	52.7	---
		G. Seielstad	47.3	---
W	35	J. Lloyd	50.3	---
		*V. V. Veysey	49.7	---
		Colorado		
W	2	T. E. Wirth	51.9	---
		*D. G. Brotzman	48.0	---
	4	*J. P. Johnson	52.0	---
		J. S. Carroll	48.0	---

* Incumbent
W - Races in which a challenger beat an incumbent.

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		Connecticut		
	4	*S. B. McKinney	53.2	---
		J. Kellis	45.2	2,869
	5	*R. A. Sarasin	50.4	2,347
		W. R. Ratchford	48.0	150
		Florida		
	12	*J. H. Burke	51.0	---
		C. Friedman	49.0	500
		Georgia		
W	4	Elliott H. Levitas	55.1	790
		*B. B. Blackborn	44.9	1,500
	6	*J. Flynt, Jr.	51.5	650
		N. Gingrich	48.5	525
		Illinois		
W	3	M. A. Russo	52.6	240
		*R. Hanrahan	47.4	---
W	10	A. J. Mikva	50.9	8,100
		*S. H. Young	49.1	12,025
	13	*R. McCrory	54.5	---
		S. Beetham	45.5	---
	17	*G. M. O'Brien	51.5	1,500
		J. Houlihan	48.5	785
	18	*R. Michel	54.8	---
		S. Nordvall	45.2	---

682

683

* Incumbent
W - Races in which a challenger beat an incumbent.

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		Illinois (contd.)		
	20	*P. Findley	54.8	2,000
		P. Mack	45.2	---
		Indiana		
W	2	F. J. Fithian	61.1	1,000
		*E. O. Landgrebe	38.9	---
	4	*J. E. Roush	51.9	---
		W. P. Helmke	46.5	---
W	6	D. Evans	52.4	---
		*W. Bray	47.6	7,049
W	8	P. Hays	53.4	315
		*R. H. Zion	46.6	---
W	10	P. R. Sharp	54.4	---
		*D. W. Dennis	45.6	---
W	11	A. Jacobs, Jr.	52.5	---
		*W. H. Hudnut	47.5	2,026
		Iowa		
	1	*E. Mezvinsky	54.4	1,000
		J. A. Leach	45.6	---
W	5	T. Harkin	51.1	500
		*W. J. Scherle	48.9	1,000
W		B. Bedell	54.6	---
		*W. Mayne	45.4	---

684

685

---

* Incumbent
W - Races in which a challenger beat an incumbent.

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		Kentucky		
	4	*G. Snyder	51.7	---
		K, Hubbard	48.3	168
		Maine		
W	1	D. Emery	50.2	2,325
		*P. Kyros	49.8	---
		Maryland		
	1	*R. E. Bauman	53.0	4,600
		T. Hatem	47.0	---
		Massachusetts		
W	5	P. E. Tsongas	60.6	---
		*P. W. Cronin	39.4	---
		Michigan		
	2	*M. J. Esch	52.3	9,100
		J. S. Reuther	45.4	2,000
	3	*G. Brown	51.2	---
		P. Todd, Jr.	47.6	2,000
	4	*E. Hutchinson	53.1	---
		R. Daugherty	45.5	---
	10	*E. Cederberg	53.7	---
		S. Marble	45.9	---
	11	*P. Ruppe	50.9	---
		F. Brouillette	48.8	9,000

* Incumbent
W - Races in which a challenger beat an incumbent.

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		Michigan (contd.)		
W	18	J. J. Blanchard	58.7	200
		*R. J. Huber	40.2	4,275
		Missouri		
	7	*G. Taylor	52.3	10
		R. L. Franks	47.7	40
		Montana		
W	1	M. S. Baucus	54.8	50
		*R. G. Shoup	45.2	150
		Nebraska		
	1	*C. Thone	53.3	---
		H. Dyas	46.7	---

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		Nevada		
W	1	J. Santini	55.8	6,740
		*D. Towell	36.4	1,930
		New Jersey		
W	1	J. J. Florio	57.5	10,052
		*J. E. Hunt	38.5	1,000
W	2	J. J. Hughes	57.3	3,261
		*C. W. Sandman	41.3	2,500
	6	*E. B. Forsythe	52.5	---
		C. B. Yates	45.5	4,500
W	7	A. Maguire	49.7	9,500
		*W. B. Widnall	44.4	---

688

* Incumbent
W - Races in which a challenger beat an incumbent.

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		New Jersey (contd.)		
W	13	H. S. Meyner	57.3	2,332
		*J. J. Maraziti	42.7	430
		New York		
W	2	T. J. Downey	48.8	1,065
		*J. R. Grover, Jr.	44.7	---
W	3	J. A. Ambro, Jr.	51.8	3,300
		*A. D. Roncallo	46.1	---
	4	*N. F. Lent	53.6	---
		F. Ornstein	46.4	400
	5	*J. Wydler	54.2	200
		A. K. Lowenstein	45.8	2,100

689

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		North Carolina		
W	29	E. W. Pattison	54.5	---
		*C. J. King	45.5	---
	30	*R. C. McEwen	55.0	---
		R. W. Tobby	45.0	---
		North Carolina		
W	5	S. L. Neal	52.0	24,910
		*Wilmer Mizell	47.6	2,933
W	6	W. G. Hefner	57.0	3,500
		*E. B. Ruth	43.0	---
	10	*J. T. Broyhill	54.4	---
		J. L. Rhyne	45.6	---

069

---

* Incumbent
W - Races in which a challenger beat an incumbent.

[000264]

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		Ohio		
W	1	W. D. Gradison, Jr.	50.9	2,000
		*T. Luken	49.1	---
	2	*D. D. Clancey	53.4	1,500
		E. W. Wocterman	46.6	---
	9	*T. C. Ashley	52.8	---
		C. S. Finkbeiner, Jr.	47.2	600
	12	*S. L. Devine	50.9	---
		F. Ryan	49.1	---
	17	*J. M. Ashbrook	52.7	500
		D. D. Nobue	47.3	---

169

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		Oklahoma		
	5	*J. Jarman	51.7	500
		M. H. Edwards	48.3	---
		Oregon		
W	4	J. Weaver	52.9	---
		*J. Dellenback	47.1	---
		Pennsylvania		
	17	*H. T. Schneebeli	52.1	---
		P. C. Wambach	47.9	500
	23	*A. W. Johnson	52.7	500
		Y. Mast	47.3	---
W	25	G. A. Myers	53.8	2,856
		*F. M. Clark	46.2	---

692

* Incumbent
W - Races in which a challenger beat an incumbent.

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		South Carolina		
W	6	J. W. Jenrette, Jr.	52.0	3,740
		*E. L. Young	48.0	4,000
		South Dakota		
W	1	L. Pressler	55.3	---
		*F. E. Denholm	44.7	---
		Tennessee		
W	3	M. Lloyd	51.1	2,641
		*L. Baker	45.9	1,056
W	8	H. E. Ford	49.9	6,833
		*D. Kuykendall	49.4	2,750
		Texas		
	5	*A. Steelman	52.1	1,050

693

		M. McKool	47.9	670
W	13	J. Hightower	57.6	560
		*R. Price	42.4	3,014
		Virginia		
	7	*J. K. Robinson	52.6	2,000
		G. H. Gilliam	47.1	---
W	8	H. Harris	57.6	500
		*S. E. Parris	42.4	7,750
	9	*W. C. Wampler	50.9	2,500
		C. J. Horne	49.1	27,475

694

---

* Incumbent.
W - Races in which a challenger beat an incumbent.

	Cong. Dist.		Percent of General Election Vote	Overage
		Virginia (contd.)		
W	10	J. L. Fisher	53.6	35
		*J. T. Broyhill	45.2	4,500
		Wisconsin		
W	3	A. J. Baldus	51.1	1,819
		*V. W. Thomson	47.4	600
W	8	R. J. Cornell	54.4	4,000
		*H. V. Froelich	45.6	500
		Wyoming		
	1	*T. Roncalio	54.7	-0-
		T. Stoock	45.3	3,075

695

		Oklahoma		
W	6	G. L. English	53.2	2,580
		*J. N. Camp	44.4	-0-

969

---

* Incumbent
W - Races in which a challenger beat an incumbent.

000266

[000267]

10. In the 1974 House campaigns in which a challenger to incumbent received 45 percent or more of the vote, incumbents had $398,097 cash on hand, while challengers had $68,051, as of September 1, 1973.

11. In those 1974 House races in which a challenger to an incumbent received 45 percent or more of the vote, incumbents received $110,798 in amounts in excess of $1,000 per individual contribution not including cash on hand. Challengers received $181,253.

12. In the forty 1974 House races in which a challenger defeated an incumbent, incumbents received $72,723 in amounts in excess of $1,000 per individual contribution not including cash on hand. Challengers received $110,894.

13. In the 1974 House races, incumbents received and repaid loans totaling the amount of $387,930. Challengers to incumbents received and repaid loans totaling the amount of $410,704. Non-incumbents (open races) received and repaid loans totaling the amount of $976,275.

[000268]

14. In the 1974 Senate races, loans received and repaid for all candidates totaled $735,063. The amount of loans received and repaid by incumbents totaled $160,000, by challengers to incumbents $55,689, by non-incumbents in open races $519,374.

15. In the 1974 Senate races, the total amount of cash on hand held by all candidates prior to September 1, 1973, was $1,423,759. Incumbents held $1,402,083 as cash on hand, challengers $21,676.

16. The 10 volumes entitled "1972 Congressional Campaign Finances" published by Common Cause provided to plaintiffs in response to a request for production of documents as hereby adopted and incorporated by reference as Exhibit D.

JAMES L. BUCKLEY, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v. **Civil Action No. 75-0001**

HON. FRANCIS R. VALEO, et al.,
Defendants.

PART III

COURT FINDINGS OF FACT

May 19, 1975

The findings herein are based upon testimony and affidavits of the following persons and are located in this Part III as indicated.

	Page
James L. Buckley	1
J. Daniel Mahoney	11
David A. Keene	16
Eugene J. McCarthy	17
Mary Monroe	24
Stewart R. Mott	26
William A. Steiger	33
Ira Glasser	41
Laura Wertheimer	45
Clarke Reed	48
James C. Roberts	52
Thomas S. Winter	56
Daniel Joy	59
Edward H. Crane, III	63
Harry M. Fox	66

[001]

JAMES L. BUCKLEY

1. James L. Buckley is a United States citizen and a citizen of the state of New York*. He is registered to vote in New York City and maintains a residence there. He is a federal taxpayer, and he is eligible to vote in elections for the office of President of the United States. Affidavit ¶1.

2. In 1968 James Buckley chose to run for the U.S. Senate to provide the voters a meaningful opportunity to choose between differing philosophical and practical approaches to government. Senator Buckley chose to run knowing he could not win and that he could not raise substantial contributions because he was seen as not "viable" and unlikely to receive a large percentage of the vote. Affidavit ¶¶5, 8.

3. In 1968, Senator Buckley accepted the Conservative Party's Senate nomination. He had never run for public office before, but he was interested in politics and the issues of concern to New York voters that year. He was also convinced that the people of New York would not have a meaningful opportunity to choose between differing philosophical and practical

---

* Although not formally qualified as such, by reason of Senator Buckley's experience as a campaigner and as a Member of Congress, the Court has treated him as an expert and permitted his opinion testimony.

approaches to government unless the Conservative Party fielded a candidate. Affidavit ¶5.

4. Senator Buckley was elected to the United States Senate on November 3, 1970 and has served as New York's junior Senator since January, 1971. Although he was enrolled as a Republican at the time, he ran in 1970 as the candidate of the Conservative Party of the State of New York. On his arrival in Washington he asked for and received permission to join the Republican Conference in the Senate. He proposes to run for a second six-year term next year. Affidavit ¶2.

5. Senator Buckley studied the Senate version of the FECA Amendments with an eye toward its possible impact on Senate races in states like New York. Affidavit ¶3.

6. Senator Buckley has stated that substantial contributions are not forthcoming to a campaign unlikely to succeed. It was not lack of funds that caused a low percentage of the vote for James Buckley in his 1968 race for the Senate; rather it was the widespread perception that he was going to receive a low percentage of the vote that caused the lack of funds. Affidavit ¶8.

7. The Republican Party's candidate was Jacob Javits and the Democratic candidate was Paul O'Dwyer. By accepting the Conservative nomination, Senator Buckley was able to present the voters with a clear alternative to the views represented by his opponents. Affidavit ¶6.

8. Senator Buckley knew he could not win in 1968. He nevertheless ran so that the Conservative Party could

register, to a degree, the extent of voter support for its views and thus could influence the major parties. He received more than 14 percent of the vote. Affidavit ¶7; Tr. 10.

9. Senator Buckley knew he could not win in 1968 because he was not a "viable" candidate, because he was unknown and no one felt a candidate of a third party, with its limited resources, could win. Affidavit ¶8.

10. After the 1968 election, Senator Buckley never intended to run for office again. Affidavit ¶10.

11. In 1970 Senator Buckley set three conditions on his entry into the Senate race: (1) that a poll would show that he could conceivably win; (2) that he could raise $100,000 in three weeks' time as a test of whether

he could raise sufficient money to run a credible race; and (3) that he would be taken seriously by the press. Affidavit ¶11; Tr. 8.

12. In 1970 James Buckley received contributions from a "handful of people" in amounts totaling $10,000 to $20,000. That money was used to finance a survey in Spring 1970 which convinced Buckley that he could plausibly enter the race for Senate if he decided he had the financial support to do so. Tr. 6-7; Affidavit ¶12.

13. Senator Buckley faced the need to assure himself of the adequate early financing that he and his advisors felt was essential to launching a successful campaign. Affidavit ¶14.

[004]

14. At this point a friend, Joseph Koopman, offered to lend the Conservative Party $50,000 earmarked for his campaign. He told Senator Buckley and his advisors that while he could afford to lend them the money he could not simply give it to the campaign. Senator Buckley decided to take the loan, knowing that they could use the money both to launch Senator Buckley's candidacy and to generate the funds to repay it. Affidavit ¶15; Tr. 6-7. That money allowed him to hire initial staff, rent a campaign headquarters, and to utilize a direct mail approach to raising more money and support. Affidavit ¶16.

15. Senator Buckley believes, on the basis of his experience, that the challenged legislation, among other things, will force political candidates to depend on large numbers of small contributors for support by depriving them of the ability to solicit the larger contributions that are especially important in launching the campaign of a relatively unknown independent. Affidavit ¶18; Tr. 10-11.

16. On the basis of his political expertise, Senator Buckley is of the opinion that the dynamics of political campaigning and fund-raising are such that the ability to raise significant amounts of "up front" money is often crucial to the initial momentum of a candidate's efforts, and that small contributions do not ordinarily materialize at the beginning of a campaign, but come in only after the candidate and his managers have been able to attract public attention

[005]

to his effort or to finance mailings. This requires money – money that Senator Buckley believes the challenged legislation makes it difficult if not impossible to raise. Affidavit ¶19.

17. Most of the $50,000 Koopman loan went into a direct mail campaign. The direct mail campaign raised $650,000 of the more than $1,800,000 raised that year. Eventually more than 40,000 persons contributed to the campaign. Affidavit ¶20; Tr. 14-16.

18. More than 35 percent of those who gave to Senator Buckley in 1970 contributed less than $20. Weil's list of contributions shows that 180 individuals (including a very few organizations) gave $1,000 or more. Affidavit ¶21; Weil Tr. 10. Both large and small contributions were greater in Senator Buckley's 1970 campaign than in his 1968 campaign. Tr. 10; Leon Weil Deposition Tr. 21-23.

19. Based upon his political expertise, Senator Buckley is of the opinion that this broad base of support was possible only because of Senator Buckley's campaign's initial ability to secure the money it needed to conduct a direct mail campaign. It is further his opinion that ability to gather a significant amount in small contributions depended in considerable measure on his ability

initially to raise a significant amount in small contributions depended in considerable measure on his ability initially to raise a significant amount in loans or contributions in excess of $1,000. Affidavit ¶22.

20. Most advertising agencies in New York require political committees to advance substantial sums of money

[006]

before they will take them on as clients. In 1970, several agencies demanded a $10,000 to $20,000 advance from Senator Buckley's campaign at the outset. Affidavit ¶23. At the time the requests for such advances were made, Senator Buckley does not know how much of the funds on hand had been raised from contributions of $1,000 or less. Senator Buckley ultimately did not retain an agency which required an advance, but used a group of young people who had just formed an agency and did not require any advance. Tr. 22-23.

21. A statewide candidate in New York needs a State campaign headquarters and several local offices. In New York City for instance, there is only a limited supply of suitable locations available at any one time – and these are sought by various candidates. Landlords and utility companies in New York City require advance deposits. In 1970, Senator Buckley's campaign had to contract in early July for space it wanted to use from September 1 through Election Day. Affidavit ¶

22. This space had to be paid for in advance. In fact, the agents for the building in which Senator Buckley's campaign sought and finally rented space would not even talk to campaign officials unless they appeared with a certified check for the amount they desired. This amounted to $18,000. $17,000 rent plus $1,000 as a security deposit. Affidavit ¶25; Tr. 23; Keene Tr. 8-10.

23. In 1970 James Buckley was required to make an initial outlay of $18,000 in deposits to pay for the expenses

[007]

of the installation of a telephone bank used in his campaign. Tr. 24; Affidavit ¶26.

24. Senator Buckley's campaigns in the past have relied heavily on volunteer support. In 1970, there were approximately 15,000 such volunteers. These volunteers, who contributed varying amounts of their time, often defrayed many of their expenses from their own pockets. Affidavit ¶28.

25. In 1970, Senator Buckley was given the loan of an airplane for two weeks. Tr. 28, 29.

26. Senator Buckley ran in 1970 as a third party candidate. Senator Buckley does not know how many persons refused to contribute to his campaign unless they could do so anonymously. He has no knowledge that any persons will refuse to contribute to him in the future because of disclosure. Affidavit ¶30; Tr. 31, 72, 75; Weil Tr. 27-28.

27. Based upon his political expertise, Senator Buckley is of the opinion that a challenger must, under normal circumstances, be able to spend more than the incumbent if he expects to win. Affidavit ¶35.

28. Senator Buckley has a staff of 52 in Washington and New York. This number includes administrative, legislative and press aides. It also includes case-workers, people who spend all their time solving problems for New Yorkers. Affidavit ¶38.

29. Senator Buckley has, in addition to his office in Washington, office space in New York City, Hempstead, Albany, Rochester and Poughkeepsie. He is currently seeking additional space in several other cities. Affidavit ¶34.

[008]

30. Senator Buckley sends out a regular newsletter to more than 200,000 New Yorkers and he is in regular contact with thousands more who are interested in specific issues. Senator Buckley is of the opinion that this is helpful politically. Affidavit ¶40; Tr. 73-74.

31. The Friends of Jim Buckley is a registered political committee under the Federal Elections Campaign Act of 1971 supporting Senator James Buckley and authorized by Senator Buckley to raise funds on his behalf. The Friends of Jim Buckley has filed reports for the period March 5, 1974 through January 31, 1975. In these reports the Friends of Jim Buckley have disclosed the names of 83 individuals who have contributed more than $100. Buckley Exs. 2a-2g.

32. Marvin Liebman is in the political fund-raising business and is a specialist in direct mail solicitation. The Friends of Jim Buckley has retained Marvin Liebman to raise funds on behalf of his campaign at a fee of $1,000 per month while the relationship continues, terminable at any time. In addition to that, the Friends of Jim Buckley is obligated to pay for mailings as they are sent out including the costs of the mailing, the postage, the printing, and paper. Tr. 21.

33. Senator Buckley has not heard that any individual contributing to "Friends of Jim Buckley," has been subject to harassment or reprisals. Senator Buckley has heard of no instances where anyone has refused to contribute to the "Friends of Jim Buckley" because of the 1974 FECA. Tr. 32-33.

[009]

34. Prior name recognition is an important factor that influences the success of a candidate. Tr. 45; McCarthy Tr. 74.

35. James Buckley desires to be a member of the majority of the Senate. Tr. 59.

36. Senator Buckley believes that his capacity to affect legislation on a broad scale depends on whether or not 20 to 30 present incumbents can be defeated. Tr. 59.

37. Senator Buckley cannot remember contributing more than $1,000 to the campaign of any candidate for federal elective office. Tr. 65.

38. Of those volunteers who incurred expenses on his behalf, Senator Buckley does not know how much they contributed to his campaigns or spent independently of his campaigns. Tr. 28.

39. Senator Buckley cannot remember contributing as much as $2,000 to candidates for federal elective office in any one calendar year. Tr. 90.

40. In his 1970 race for the U.S. Senate, Senator Buckley and his immediate family spent under $20,000 on his campaign. Senator Buckley and his immediate family spent less than $20,000 on his 1968 campaign. Tr. 65-66.

41. The following table shows minimum number of contributors giving various size contributions to Senator James Buckley's 1970 Senate campaign:

[010]

SIZE OF CONTRIBUTION	NUMBER OF PERSONS
$100	998
$101 to $499	502
$500 to $999	151
$1,000 and over	180

Weil Tr. 21-22. These may not be complete. Weil Tr. 23, 29.

42. Senator Buckley's 1970 campaign received approximately $150,000 in loans. $50,000 of that amount was received from Mr. Koopman at the beginning of the campaign, and the remainder ($100,000) was received from three individuals at the end of the campaign. Weil Tr. 14-15.

43. The true value of incumbency is difficult to quantify. Tr. 49.

44. Buckley has stated that wealthy candidates prior to the FECA Amendments of 1974 had an advantage over those with less funds available. Buckley Exh. 3 at S4806, Buckley Tr. 53.

[011]

J. DANIEL MAHONEY

1. J. Daniel Mahoney is the State Chairman of the Conservative Party of the State of New York and has served continuously in that office since November, 1962, when the Conservative Party of the State of New York became an established political party under the election laws of New York Affidavit ¶2.

2. The Conservative Party of the State of New York has nominated in the past and intends to nominate in 1976 candidates for the offices of President of the United States, United States Senator from the State of New York, and Members of the United States House of Representatives from all or nearly all of the Congressional Districts of the State of New York. The Party will seek to place its candidate for President only on the ballot in New York. Affidavit ¶3.

3. The Conservative Party of the State of New York has in the past solicited and received individual contributions in excess of $1,000 towards the election of its

candidates. It desires to do so in 1976. Affidavit ¶4; Tr. 41-42.

4. The Conservative Party of the State of New York registers and reports with the Comptroller General of the United States as a political committee; in these reports names of contributors giving in excess of $100 have been disclosed. Mahoney Tr. 14-15, 20. The "1974 Fund to Defeat Jacob Javits" (an affiliated organization of the Conservative Party of the State of New York) registers and reports as a political committee under the FECA. The "1974 Fund to Defeat Jacob Javits" has disclosed the names of individuals who contributed to that committee. Most of the contributors whose names were disclosed contributed less than $100. Mahoney Ex. 10.

[012]

5. The Conservative Party believes it is essential for the Party to solicit individual contributions in excess of $1,000 early in campaigns in order to obtain the necessary "seed money" to finance direct-mail fund-raising appeals to small contributors, to open and operate campaign headquarters, to make initial funding commitments to advertising agencies, and to buy media time before it is preempted by political opponents. Affidavit ¶5; Tr. 31.

6. As the Conservative Party candidate, Barbara Keating's 1974 New York senate-seat campaign raised approximately $190,000 primarily in small contributions. In her campaign, the party used direct-mail fund-raising as provided by the Viguerie Organization. This organization did not demand payment in advance, but collected their fee as so many cents per letter sent. The organization, as a matter of standard routine, finances a mailing and there is no need for a campaign which hires the Viguerie group to put money up front. The Conservative Party used the Viguerie Organization in 1973 and 1974, but

did not renew the contract for 1976. Tr. 23, 25-26.

7. The Conservative Party intends (i) to contribute amounts in excess of $5,000 to as many of its candidates for federal office as it is able, (ii) to expend on behalf of its candidate for President of the United States an amount in excess of $5,000, (iii) to expend, if possible, an amount in excess of two cents multiplied by the voting age population of the State of New York in the case of its candidate for United

[013]

States Senator, and (iv) to expend an amount in excess of $10,000 in the case of many candidates for the House of Representatives. Affidavit ¶6.

8. In 1962, the Conservative Party circulated petitions to establish the party as a legal entity in the State. During that effort, there was a campaign of harassment against people signing that petition during which individuals in various departments of the state government participated by talking to people in regulated businesses who had signed the petition. Two major newspapers in the state ran editorials deploring this practice and, as a result of these articles, the campaign of harassment against the Conservative Party was dropped. Tr. 11-12.

9. Mahoney knows of no instance in which any of the individuals whose names were disclosed to the federal government under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 have been subject to harassment or reprisals as a result of this disclosure. Tr. 21.

10. The Conservative Party in its past campaigns in support of candidates has received the bulk of its funds from persons contributing less than $1,000 to any candidate. Affidavit ¶4; Tr. 22-28, 30.

11. The Conservative Party does not make expenditures on behalf of candidates. It channels all its campaign activities, including expenditures, through various political committees. Tr. 35. As a result, there has been no instance where the Conservative Party of the State of New York has itself directly expended in excess of $10,000 in the case of a candidate for the House of Representatives. Tr. 35.

[014]

12. No candidate of the Conservative Party for the United States Senate has expended personal funds in excess of $35,000 on behalf of his own campaign. Tr. 36.

13. Mahoney cannot identify any candidate for the House of Representatives of the Conservative Party of the State of New York since 1962 who has expended as much as $25,000 in personal funds on behalf of his own campaign. Tr. 36-37.

14. Mahoney does not know how much was received in contributions of $1,000 or less for the "1974 Fund to Defeat Jacob Javits," or how many contributions were received in excess of $1,000 for the Keating 1974 senate campaign or the Buckley 1968 senate campaign. Tr. 22, 26.

15. The Conservative Party has never nominated a presidential candidate who was not also the presidential candidate of another political party. Tr. 39.

16. The Conservative Party had a problem getting its 1974 senatorial candidate, Barbara Keating, equal television coverage with the candidates Clark and Javits. After protesting vigorously they were eventually successful at getting the media to include her in certain debates. Tr. 44-45.

17. The Conservative Party spent approximately $190,000 on Barbara Keating's race for the Senate in 1974. Mahoney regards that campaign as a success, in that Ms. Keating's campaign (1) obtained a certain minimal level of financing to allow articulation of the party's position, (2) caused the media to take the candidate seriously and regard the election as a three-way race, and (3) allowed the Party to have an impact on whoever was elected to the Senate. Mr.

[015]

Mahoney feels she could have raised less than $190,000 and still have run a successful race in such terms. Tr. 59-63.

[016]

DAVID A. KEENE

1. David A. Keene is Executive Assistant to Senator James Buckley of New York. In 1964 he was campaign manager for a Congressional candidate in Wisconsin. He has been an official of three political organizations which raised money. In all these capacities, he has been involved in raising money through the mails. Tr. 3, 15-17.

2. Senator Buckley, according to Keene, uses the frank to mail newsletters periodically to a list of about 280,000 persons in the State of New York. That list, which is kept on the Senate computer, catalogues by issue the individuals who wrote Senator Buckley. There are approximately thirty such issue categories. Tr. 19-21.

[017]

EUGENE J. McCARTHY

1. On January 12, 1975 Eugene McCarthy* declared his Independent candidacy for President of the United

States. He is not seeking the nomination of either of the two major parties, and his candidacy has no tie to any political party. Tr. 8-9, 66; Affidavit ¶ 1.

2. Eugene McCarthy and the Committee for a Constitutional Presidency, which is supporting him, are seeking to place his candidacy on the ballot in all 50 states and the District of Columbia in the 1976 election. His candidacy involves no primary elections, caucuses or conventions. Tr. 9-10; Affidavit ¶ 1. The Committee for a Constitutional Presidency – McCarthy '76 has no present intention to hold a nominating convention. Tr. 86.

3. In 1967-68 Senator McCarthy challenged an incumbent President of the United States for the presidential nomination of the Democratic party. Senator McCarthy was then an incumbent Senator. The major issue in that contest was the war in Vietnam, which the incumbent President supported and Senator McCarthy opposed.

---

* Although not formally qualified as such, by reason of Senator McCarthy's experience as a campaigner and as a former Member of Congress, the Court has treated him as an expert and permitted his opinion testimony.

[018]

Upon the basis of his political expertise, Senator McCarthy expressed the opinion that an incumbent President has significant advantages over a challenger in that the incumbent exercises control over his party's national committee; the incumbent can call upon the Vice President and members of his cabinet to campaign for him; the incumbent has easier access to radio and television time; and is able to use government programs

and power to advance the incumbent campaign. Affidavit ¶4.

4. A large part of the contributions raised for Senator McCarthy's 1968 campaign came from persons who were willing to contribute large sums of money. Several contributed more than $100,000 each in the course of the campaign. Several others contributed more than $50,000 each. The total contributions to Senator McCarthy's campaign approximated $11 million. Senator McCarthy is unable to state either how much or what percentage of that sum was in contributions in excess of $1,000. However, at least 24 persons contributed amounts over $1,000 through the time of the New Hampshire primary. The specific contributions ranged from $1,069 to $15,000. The total received from the 24 large contributors was $95,869. Affidavit ¶6; Tr. 5-6, 33.

5. Eugene McCarthy's decision to enter the New Hampshire primary was made after January 1, 1968. The New Hampshire primary was held in the middle of March, 1968. Tr. 32.

[019]

6. Small contributions did come in to Senator McCarthy's campaign in large amounts after the New Hampshire primary. Advertisements run in the New York Times produced an extensive response. But without the large contributions received during that primary campaign, Senator McCarthy believes it is doubtful that he could have run well in New Hampshire. Affidavit ¶8; Tr. 36-37.

7. President Johnson withdrew from the presidential contest on March 31, 1968. Subsequently Vice President Humphrey entered the race. Affidavit ¶8; Tr. 39.

8. In competing with Vice President Humphrey, McCarthy relied on a combination of large and small donors. Senator McCarthy believes that had the current limits on contributions been in effect at that time, it would have been far more difficult for him to compete with the Vice President. The Vice President won the Democratic Party's nomination. Affidavit ¶10.

9. Senator McCarthy does not know how much of the $11 million raised for his '68 primary was from contributions in excess of $1,000. Tr. 37. Senator McCarthy does not know how much was raised after New Hampshire in contributions in excess of $1,000, but believes that contributions (one of $100,000 and one of $500,000), came after New Hampshire. Tr. 39-40.

Senator McCarthy does not know if he solicited or received contributions in excess of $5,000 from any organized group in other races. Tr. 91.

[020]

10. Senator McCarthy does not know if some New Hampshire money might not have been used later in the campaign. Senator McCarthy does not know if after New Hampshire there were any funds left. Tr. 34-35.

11. Senator McCarthy's campaign was also aided by many volunteer workers, many of them young. Most of the young volunteers were unable to offer direct financial support but they gave freely of their time and effort, meeting most of their expenses out of their own pockets. Many stayed with the campaign for long periods, going from state primary to state primary. These two groups of citizens – a small number of large financial contributors and a large number of hard-working volunteers – complemented each other. Affidavit ¶12; Tr. 103.

12. President Ford has announced his intention to seek election in 1976. Senator McCarthy does not hold federal or state office, either elective or appointive.

13. Many high-ranking Executive Branch officials can be used as campaigners for the President, even as they nominally act in non-partisan ways. In 1972, former President Nixon used such officials as "surrogates" for the President. Many men and women in the armed forces of the United States are called upon to perform personal services for the President. For example, members of the military fly the President's planes, staff his yacht, attend to his medical needs, and chauffeur his White House staff members. Affidavit ¶ 14.

[021]

14. Senator McCarthy and the defendants agree that it is difficult in any case to raise enough money to compete against an incumbent President. Affidavit ¶ 16.

15. Political parties use national nominating conventions for numerous publicity purposes quite apart from nominating Presidential candidates. Their underlying concern with favorable publicity explains the prime-TV time convention sessions and the seemingly endless parade of speakers being "shown" to the public. The height of publicity-seeking is, of course, when an incumbent President is to be renominated. In 1964 President Johnson, and in 1972 President Nixon, successfully used the conventions in their reelection efforts. The Committee for Constitutional Presidency does not intend to hold a national nominating convention in 1976. Affidavit ¶ 21; Tr. 12, 86.

16. Each major-party nominee in the general election campaign will be freed from the need to spend time and effort in fundraising. Senator McCarthy believes as an

independent candidate that he will not enjoy that advantage. Affidavit ¶ 22.

17. Of the six members of the Federal Election Commission, two are former Democratic congressmen, two are former Republican congressmen, and one is a former president of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women. Affidavit ¶ 23.

18. Approximately 350,000 to 500,000 signatures are necessary to obtain ballot status in California for Eugene J. McCarthy's presidential candidacy. Tr. 20-21.

[022]

19. Eugene McCarthy anticipates a great deal of informal and unstructured political activity by volunteers supporting his candidacy for the Presidency in 1976. Tr. 102, 104-105.

20. Senator McCarthy has entered the 1976 presidential race in spite of only a modest financial backing, and has continued to remain a candidate even though extensive efforts to raise funds before the 1974 Amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act came into effect have had limited success. Tr. 49-61.

21. Senator McCarthy believes that neither he nor other candidates are likely to get large contributors for campaigns in 1976 of the magnitude that he got in his 1968 bid for the presidency because of the appeal of the issue in 1968 – the continuation of the war in Vietnam. Tr. 100.

22. Senator McCarthy would like to spend more than $24 million for his 1976 campaign and is "hopeful" of raising that amount. Tr. 19, 22.

23. For his 1976 campaign, Eugene McCarthy has raised $59,000 to date. Of this, five or six contributions

in excess of $1,000 were received. Tr. 49-50.

24. Senator McCarthy or his campaign staff has had conversations with several direct-mail fund-raising firms, but has not so far decided to use them to raise money for his 1976 campaign. Tr. 61-64.

25. Eugene McCarthy does not have access to any institutional support, and thus does not know that he will receive donations from groups that would qualify for the $5,000 maximum contribution allowed political committees. Tr. 6-7.

26. Senator McCarthy is unable to state whether the $25,000 aggregate contribution limit from individuals might harm his campaign. Tr. 6.

27. Senator McCarthy does not know how much money was raised for the 1972 Presidential nominating conventions of the two major parties. Tr. 12.

28. Eugene McCarthy cannot afford to put $50,000 of his own money in his campaign for the presidential election in 1976. Tr. 7.

29. An independent candidate faces difficulty in raising campaign contributions due to the loyalty to the two-party system in America. Tr. 8, 72.

30. Senator McCarthy says that on philosophical grounds he would not accept public financing for his campaign for presidency even if after the election he qualifies for it. Tr. 89-90.

31. Prior to January 1, 1975, the effective date of the FECA, the Committee for a Constitutional Presidency received a number of contributions in excess of $1,000 from individuals and $2,000 from couples. Senator McCarthy believes his 1976 campaign is being harmed

by the contribution limitations of the 1974 Act. Tr. 6, 50-53.

[024]

MARY MONROE

1. Mary Monroe is the Treasurer of the Committee for a Constitutional Presidency – McCarthy '76 (hereinafter "The Committee.")

2. The Committee for a Constitutional Presidency was established in July, 1974. At a Chicago conference in August of 1974, the Committee announced its intention to field an Independent ticket for President and Vice President of the United States in the 1976 election. In January, 1975 the Committee asked Eugene J. McCarthy to be its presidential candidate. He accepted; the Committee then became his principal campaign committee and added "McCarthy '76" to its name. The Committee's vice presidential candidate will be selected by the spring of 1976. Affidavit ¶2.

3. The Committee for a Constitutional Presidency – McCarthy '76 is a registered political committee under the FECA, and has filed reports of receipts and expenditures for the period from July 1974 to the present.

4. The Committee has been informed by officials of Idaho, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, and Utah that their states do not permit Independent candidates for President to appear on the ballot in the general election or that there are no provisions in their laws for placing Independent candidates for President on the ballot. The Committee expects to challenge such laws on constitutional grounds. The Committee may also challenge the ballot placement laws of several other states. The time and expense that such legal challenges involve are problems

unique to candidates running outside the Democratic and Republican parties. Affidavit ¶4.

[025]

5. The Committee for a Constitutional Presidency – McCarthy '76 raised $38,559 prior to January 1, 1975. Tr. 14.

6. The Committee attempted to raise contributions in excess of $1,000 before the effective date of the FECA amendments of 1974. While there was no target total amount the Committee was seeking to raise by the first of January, 1975, it hoped to raise substantially more than it did. Tr. 16-17.

7. The Committee for a Constitutional Presidency – McCarthy '76 received contributions from five individuals in excess of $1,000 prior to January 1, 1975. Monroe Ex. 4.

8. The Committee for a Constitutional Presidency – McCarthy '76 has disclosed the names of fifteen individuals who contributed over $100 to the Committee for a Constitutional Presidency. Monroe Exs. 2-6.

9. William Clay Ford contributed $21,000 in 1974 to the Committee for a Constitutional Presidency. Ford also made and cancelled a loan of $9,000 to the Committee in 1974. Tr. 15-16.

10. At present, the Committee relies heavily upon a volunteer Certified Public Accountant to ensure that its financial reports to the government are complete and accurate.

11. Ms. Monroe knows of no donors to the Committee whose names have been disclosed to the supervisory officers who have been subject to harassment. Tr. 41.

[026]

STEWART R. MOTT

1. Stewart R. Mott is a citizen of the State of New York and of the United States, and he is eligible to vote in elections for the office of President of the United States. He is a registered voter in the State of New York, and a federal taxpayer. Affidavit ¶1.

2. In October 1963, Mott helped form the Flint Planned Parenthood Association, became its President in June 1964, was principal organizer, administrator, fund-raiser, publicist, promoter, community-relations specialist and clinic director. He provided the major share of funds and spent well in excess of $1,000 of non-reimbursed personal monies during the first year in helping to create the right political and community-leadership climate to accept the then-controversial first birth control clinic in Flint, Michigan. Affidavit ¶2.

3. During the following eight years, Mott gave more than $1,000,000 in support of Planned Parenthood programs, a large part of which was donated in support of candidates for federal office who endorsed expanded family planning services. Affidavit ¶3.

4. During the years 1965-1967, Mott was periodically involved with the Vietnam protest "movement" and spent at least $1,000 annually on behalf of efforts to affect public policy and to elect federal candidates who would vote to extricate the U.S. from Vietnam. Affidavit ¶5.

5. In February 1968, Mott made a donation of $1,000 to a Presidential candidate, namely Eugene McCarthy. Affidavit ¶8.

[027]

6. On March 1, 1968, Mott contracted with the New York Times and eight Michigan newspapers to run two-page advertisements, signed by him, to encourage Nelson Rockefeller to present himself as a Republican alternative to Richard Nixon. These advertisements which cost him an immediate out-of-pocket $25,000 brought $144,000 in pledges of public support of Mott's position, which donations were pledged to encourage a Rockefeller candidacy. Affidavit ¶9.

7. During the months of March, April, and May 1968, Mott managed and financed an authorized Rockefeller presidential committee. During that period, he spent $100,000 of his own money, plus aboot $40,000 of public donations to encourage Rockefeller's candidacy. Affidavit ¶9.

8. In June 1968, Mott joined on as Chairman for Special Gifts in the McCarthy campaign. During the following three months, he gave directly $200,000 to the McCarthy effort, spent personally on a non-reimbursed basis several thousand dollars for travel, telephone, personnel, etc., and assisted in raising several million dollars for the McCarthy effort. As Chairman for Special Gifts, he sought out donors of $5,000-and-over, and had frequent continuing contact with those who gave $25,000 and more. Affidavit ¶12. Mott worked full time as a volunteer for three months in Eugene McCarthy's campaign. Tr. 47.

[028]

9. In the November elections of 1968, Mott assisted financially a variety of Congressional candidates who favored Vietnam withdrawal. Not long after November 1968, he became a member of the National Committee

for an Effective Congress and has worked ever since with NCEC and other candidate-support groups to help build a U.S. Congress which would provide appropriate oversight on what he considers American military adventurism abroad.

10. In 1970, Mott helped to organize an effort known as "Peace, Inc." which put on fund-raising entertainment on behalf of Congressional candidates. In that year, aside from regular salaries and office expense, he donated over $30,000 to various Congressional candidates and expended about $15,000 on behalf of "Peace, Inc." Virtually all of his political gifts and expenses in 1970 were directed toward candidates who supported U.S. withdrawal from Indochina. Affidavit ¶16.

11. Late in 1970, Mott met with George McGovern and a group of other political leaders and major donors. In January 1971, he donated $5,000 to the McGovern campaign for the Democratic Presidential nomination, as did several others. Affidavit ¶18.

12. One reason that McGovern turned to Mott for assistance was because about a year earlier he had sought to put on special nationwide network television program about Vietnam. On a Friday before the Monday broadcast date, he asked Stewart R. Mott to lend $35,000 to pay for the network time in order to get the program on. Affidavit ¶19.

[029]

13. In 1971, Mott attempted to bring together the so-called liberal-progressive Democratic campaigns in an effective, collaborative manner so that candidates McGovern and McCarthy and Lindsay and Chisolm would not collide in the early 1972 primaries to their mutual detriment. He hosted meetings of their campaign mana-

gers, advised them on the delegate selection process and sought to avoid conflict among them on issues of common concern. During the last several months of 1971 he expended more than $1,000 on these activities, not on behalf of any one candidate, but with concern about the success of all four. Affidavit ¶ 20.

14. During February and March of 1972, Mott undertook to find out where Edmund Muskie's campaign money came from. The project, which cost him some $40,000 was not authorized by the Muskie campaign. In order to acquaint the public and the press with his findings, Stewart R. Mott placed advertisements in dozens of newspapers in various parts of the country, asking Muskie to make full disclosure of his campaign finances and asking him the question: "Where does your money come from?" Affidavit ¶ 21.

15. During 1972, Mott became actively engaged in the McGovern campaign, loaned monies approximately $50,000 for direct mail start-up purposes, gave about $350,000 to various McGovern committees, and expended some $50,000 for personal expenses. Affidavit ¶ 25.

[030]

16. In 1972, Mott spent, gave, and/or loaned over $50,000 to publicize Nixon's words: "Those who have had a chance for four years, and could not produce peace, should not be given another chance." His efforts to publicize that statement were undertaken outside the auspices of the McGovern campaign. Affidavit ¶ 26.

17. In September and October 1972, using a political committee named "Vote for Peace," Mott arranged a network television half-hour prime time in order to give Congressional candidates a chance to speak. He loaned the Committee over $90,000 in order to

purchase the TV time. Affidavit ¶ 27. In 1972 he contributed $73,469 to 51 candidates for federal office through the "Vote for Peace" program. Of this amount, $32,566 was contributed to 28 incumbent candidates and $24,617 was contributed to challengers. The balance was contributed to candidates who ran in races in which no incumbent competed. Additionally, Mr. Mott made six contributions directly to candidates to the House and Senate for a total of $15,415. Four of the six were to incumbents for a total of $11,915. The two challengers received $3,500 total.

18. In 1974, Mott's total direct and indirect expenditures on behalf of Congressional candidates was about $80,000. This figure includes contributions to twenty candidates for the Senate, in amounts ranging from $100 to $3,000, and totalling approximately $21,000. It also includes contributions to 91 candidates for the House, in amounts ranging from $100 to $3,000, and totalling approximately $49,000. Additionally, he estimates his personal expenses in connection with the 1974 campaign to be $10,000. Affidavit ¶ 29.

[031]

In 1974 Mott contributed financially to 13 incumbent members of the House of Representatives and 7 incumbent members of the Senate. He contributed to five Senatorial candidates challenging incumbents and 28 House candidates challenging incumbents. He also contributed to 8 candidates for the Senate where there was no incumbent in the race and 17 candidates for the House of Representatives where there was no incumbent in the race. He also contributed to 32 candidates for the House who were either challengers or who were running in races where there was no incumbent. Tr. 8-9.

In 1974 Mott contributed $7,200 to incumbent candidates seeking reelection to the Senate; he contributed $4,700 to challengers against incumbent Senators; and $8,850 to candidates for the Senate where there were no incumbents. In 1974 he contributed $5,000 to incumbent members of the House seeking reelection, $14,950 to challengers to incumbents in the House; $18,235 to candidates running in races where there were no incumbents; and $10,500 to candidates who were either challengers or who were running in races where there were no incumbents. Tr. 10.

In 1974 Mott made 16 contributions in excess of $1,000 and 94 of $1,000 or less to House and Senate candidates. The 94 contributions of $1,000 or less plus the first $1,000 of the 16 contributions in excess of $1,000 totalled $53,485. The total of the amount in excess of $1,000 of the 16 contributions is $16,360.

[032]

19. Mott contributed $1,000 to the candidacy of Nicholas Johnson in the Iowa Third Congressional District in 1974. Tr. 25-26.

20. Mott has given substantial sums of money to political candidates and their supporting committees, made expenditures in campaigns independent of any candidate or party, and given money to numerous organizations that conduct "issue" campaigns or which work for social goals that he supports. As for the last of these three categories he has given $63,953 to the National Committee for an Effective Congress during the period 1968-74, $6,000 to the Center for Public Financing of Elections in 1973-74, and $1,000 to Common Cause in 1973. Affidavit ¶31.

21. Mott's approximate net worth is $3 million. Tr. 51.

[033]

WILLIAM A. STEIGER

1. William A. Steiger* is a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District of Wisconsin. He is a citizen and registered voter in the State of Wisconsin and is eligible to vote in elections for federal offices. He has represented the Sixth District since 1967. He is considering a candidacy for federal office in 1976. It is possible that he will be a candidate for the United States Senate in 1976. Congressman Steiger based upon his experience and expertise in the field of politics believes that the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974 will enhance his chances of reelection to the House of Representatives, and – by the same token – will severely hinder his ability, and the ability of other eligible citizens, to challenge the likely candidacy of one of his state's incumbent United States Senators whose term expires in 1976. Affidavit ¶¶1, 33; Tr. 9. He is further of the opinion that the limitations on expenditures are too low; and that they serve mainly to preserve the political status quo, by benefiting incumbent federal office-holders because challengers' chances will be less under the challenged statutes than otherwise; affidavit ¶2; Tr. 18,

---

* Although not formally qualified as such, by reason of Congressman Steiger's experience as a campaigner and as a Member of Congress, the Court had treated him as an expert and permitted his opinion testimony.

[034]

that campaigning for federal elective office necessarily costs money; that it is false to assume that the prices which candidates must pay in order to communicate their ideas and positions are pegged to the number of voters;

and that these limits ignore the variances that exist in media coverage and costs capabilities across the nation. Affidavit ¶ 5. In support of his opinion he relies upon a comparison of the advertising costs and voter coverage of two major daily newspapers, The Milwaukee Journal and The Washington Post. A full-page advertisement in a Sunday edition of The Milwaukee Journal will cost a Senate candidate $2,424. The Sunday edition has a Wisconsin circulation of 545,000. A full-page advertisement in a Sunday edition of The Washington Post will cost a candidate $7,713. In the area of its heaviest circulation, the State of Maryland, The Post's Sunday edition has a circulation of 297,197.

2. Congressman Steiger is of the opinion that allowing a higher limit for the general election ignores the fact that the major election battle frequently takes place in the primary. Affidavit ¶ 9.

3. A candidate running statewide in Wisconsin confronts an electorate of 2,965,000, according to the Bureau of the Census. The State is large geographically, and travel costs are high. The State also has a large number of newspapers, radio stations and television outlets. A 1973 report of the Governor's Study Committee on Campaign Finance listed more than 40 daily newspapers, more than 300 weekly newspapers,

[035]

19 commercial television stations, and more than 130 commercial radio stations. Affidavit ¶ 10.

4. There is no television station in the Sixth District of Wisconsin. A candidate seeking television exposure will go to Green Bay or Milwaukee. In the Third District of Wisconsin there are television stations in Eau Claire and La Crosse, which are cities in the District.

Tr. 7. In comparing the costs of campaigning among Congressional districts, the factors to consider are how a candidate, in a particular kind of district, tries to reach the constituency, what the resources are that are available for campaigning, and the different costs involved. Congressman Steiger, however, has not analyzed or surveyed the costs, over time, of campaigns for federal office in various congressional districts. Congressman Steiger believes that historical analysis does not meet the issues. Tr. 7-10.

5. Gaylord Nelson spent $470,000 to win reelection as United States Senator from Wisconsin in 1968. William Proxmire spent $372,934 to win reelection as United States Senator from Wisconsin in 1970. Affidavit ¶ 12; Tr. 12.

6. Congressman Steiger believes that, if winning candidates use contributions received in excess of their expenditure limitations to defray their expenses of holding federal office, the power of incumbency will be strengthened further. Affidavit ¶ 15.

[036]

7. Incumbents, including Congressman Steiger, have available to them rent-free offices (one in Washington and three at home), which are unavailable to non-incumbents, plus their personal and committee staffs. Affidavit ¶ 17. Most members of Congress will, from time to time, have their staffs involved in their campaigns for reelection. A staff member on the payroll of the House of Representatives has written a political speech for William A. Steiger. It is a common practice, according to Congressman Steiger, for staff members on the payroll of the House of Representatives to write political speeches for the Congressman whom they serve. Tr. 31-33.

8. Congressman Steiger does not believe that incumbency per se makes it easier for a candidate to raise campaign funds, but that there are a number of other factors. Tr. 85.

9. Congressman Steiger has personal knowledge as to the use made of the franking privilege by Members of the Senate and of the United States House of Representatives. Tr. 36-37. Incumbents do make use of the frank. It is available as a way of communicating with constituents. The frank has a variety of specific purposes: to announce office hours, to send out press releases, to seek opinions, to educate about issues of the day, and to inform. Affidavit ¶ 19.

10. Congressman Steiger sends a postal patron newsletter to 160,000 postal patrons. Tr. 44-45.

[037]

11. Incumbents make use of the House and Senate Recording Studios. Incumbents enjoy lower recording rates, and their words tend to be counted as news. Affidavit ¶ 19.

12. Once every week, for instance, Congressman Steiger makes a five-minute radio tape. It is duplicated by the Recording Studio and is mailed by his office to 24 radio stations serving his District. These reports have been broadcast every week for more than eight years, at a cost to him of less than $40 a month. Affidavit ¶ 20.

13. During his first year in Congress, Congressman Steiger made a monthly TV report, which was mailed to six Milwaukee and Green Bay stations just outside the Sixth District. In 1967, the cost each month of producing these six TV clips was $30. Affidavit ¶ 22. In 1967, Congressman Steiger's office – during the first nine

months – mailed out 110 press releases and 36 weekly newspaper reports. These mailings do not include the announcements of Federal grants and public projects that went to selected newspapers, or the photographs of Wisconsin visitors standing on the Capitol steps that were sent to their weekly newspapers. All of this newspaper activity cost nothing more than the paper and mimeograph ink that are available at cost through the House Stationery Room. These actions were taken, according to Congressman Steiger, in the hope of enhancing his chances for reelection. Affidavit ¶ 23; Tr. 44-46.

[038]

14. Congressman Steiger sends a weekly newspaper report to all the newspapers, radio stations, and television stations that cover his Congressional district, and organizations and individuals who have requested it. Tr. 44.

15. At the end of his first nine months in office, a professional survey showed Congressman Steiger's identification with the voters was far more secure. The support spread between Steiger and Race, the previous incumbent, had grown from a narrow four percent to a more comfortable 35 percent. Affidavit ¶ 24.

16. In August 1968, near the end of Congressman Steiger's first term, Market Opinion Research reported that exactly 70 percent of Wisconsin's Sixth District voters correctly answered the question, "Can you give me the name of your Congressman?" Affidavit ¶ 25.

17. Although Congressman Steiger's district boundaries were changed substantially by reapportionment in 1972, the incumbent identity factor has changed very little. District-wide, in 1974, 61 percent could answer the question, "Who is your Congressman?" In the populous

eastern counties of the District – those which had been part of the Sixth District before reapportionment – fully 75 percent were able to answer correctly. Affidavit ¶ 26.

18. Congressman Steiger spent $63,858.72 in his 1966 campaign for the United States House of Representatives. Tr. 48.

[039]

19. Carl Steiger, Congressman Steiger's father, contributed $4,000 to his son's campaign in 1966.

20. The Wisconsin Republican Party contributed $4,000 to Congressman Steiger's campaign in 1966. Tr. 49, 85.

21. The nature of a Congressional district as a swing district (one in which the last election produced a vote for the winner that was 55 percent or below) can have an impact on the ease with which money can be raised by a candidate for office. Congressman Steiger's district, the Sixth District of Wisconsin, was perceived in 1966 as a swing district. Tr. 85-87. In non-swing district races challengers will, on balance, find it more difficult to raise funds than incumbents. Tr. 82, 89.

22. In "non-swing" races, it is Congressman Steiger's belief, that generally, challengers have more difficulty raising campaign funds than do incumbents, but that it is not substantially more difficult. Tr. 89.

23. Congressman Steiger did not spend a considerable amount of time in 1966 attempting to raise funds for his campaign, and spends less time as an incumbent attempting to raise campaign funds. Tr. 85, 103.

24. Public opinion polls influence a candidate's approach to a campaign. Tr. 82.

[040]

25. In each of his campaigns for the House of Representatives in 1966, 1968, 1970, 1972 and 1974, Congressman Steiger expended less than $64,000. Tr. 48, 67, 96-97. Congressman Steiger does not know what his incumbent opponent raised and expended in 1966, or what any of his opponents expended in campaigns in the period 1968-1974. Tr. 73, 97.

26. Based upon his own experience, Congressman Steiger believes it is a general proposition that incumbents principally devote their attention to resource allocation, while challengers expend much effort acquiring the resources. Tr. 85, 87. Fundraising is affected by a number of factors. Tr. 89-90.

[041]

IRA GLASSER

1. Ira Glasser is the Executive Director of the New York Civil Liberties Union (hereinafter NYCLU), an affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union (hereinafter ACLU), which is organized as a not-for-profit corporation under the laws of New York. He has served on the staff of NYCLU since 1967, and has served as Executive Director since 1970. He is a registered voter in the State of New York. Affidavit ¶1.

2. The NYCLU is a non-partisan organization, dedicated to defending the rights guaranteed to persons under the Constitution of the United States and having as a principal function the dissemination of information concerning such rights within the State of New York. Affidavit ¶ 2.

3. As the New York State affiliate of the ACLU, the NYCLU is barred by the ACLU Constitution and policies from endorsing or opposing any candidate for

public office. NYCLU is, however, allowed to criticize public officials whose conduct violates civil liberties and to publicize the civil liberties record of any government official. Affidavit ¶ 2.

No advertisement, petition, or public statement of the NYCLU has ever advocated the election or defeat of a political candidate. Glasser Tr. 8.

4. Although NYCLU does not endorse or oppose the election of candidates, its advertisements, statements of views on public issues, and other similar activities frequently and necessarily refer to, praise, criticize, set forth, describe

[042]

or rate the conduct or actions of clearly identified public officials who may also happen to be candidates for federal office. The fact that a public official identified in NYCLU public information activities is also at the time a candidate for public office is not directly related to the intent or purpose of the advertisement. Tr. 75-76.

5. NYCLU regularly publicizes in its membership newsletter and through pamphlets and other publications, the civil liberties voting records, positions and actions of elected public officials, some of whom are candidates for federal office. Affidavit ¶ 12; Deposition 12, 91, 92, 111-12, 115-16.

6. The newsletters are published approximately six times a year, at a cost of in excess of $1,000 per issue. Affidavit ¶ 12; Deposition 93.

7. The expenses of producing the newsletters are normally paid for out of NYCLU general funds, supplied by membership dues and contributions. Affidavit ¶ 12.

8. Each year NYCLU publishes and widely disseminates one issue of its newsletter devoted to an analysis and review of the preceding session of the New York legislature. Certain of the state legislators whose public actions are described may be candidates for nomination or election to federal office in 1974, and in virtually every federal election year, there are some state legislators rated by NYCLU who also are federal candidates at the time the ratings are published. Affidavit ¶ 13; Deposition 92-93.

[043]

9. NYCLU expects to publish these ratings again this summer and in the summer of 1976, times when primary elections are usually held. Deposition 118-19.

10. Almost all of NYCLU's public education activities are paid for out of general organizational funds supplied by membership dues and contributions, and the prime source of NYCLU's funds is contributions by members. Affidavit ¶ 20; Deposition 14-18.

11. NYCLU has in excess of 40,000 members in New York, who reside in all parts of the state. Affidavit ¶ 20; Deposition 100.

12. Membership dues are $15 per year, though many members contribute more than that, and approximately 500 contribute more than $100 per year. Affidavit ¶ 20; Deposition 100.

13. NYCLU's experience has been that membership in association or identification with and support for NYCLU is controversial. Affidavit ¶ 22; Deposition 27, 28-30, 32, 35-38, 40, 81, 83-84.

14. There is no specific evidence of a direct relationship between any harassments, reprisals, or threats of harassments or reprisals against persons associated with or

contributing to the New York Civil Liberties Union and their identification as contributors to the NYCLU. Tr. 31, 80, 132-33.

15. NYCLU members and contributors request explicit assurances that their membership will remain confidential and their contribution anonymous. Deposition 28. An average

[044]

of 25-50 contributors to the NYCLU annually request anonymity, out of a membership totalling approximately 45,000. Of the 25-50, few possibly 4 or 5 -- make contributions in excess of $100. Tr. 43, 100.

16. Plaintiff NYCLU maintains two separate and distinct funds for accounting purposes. Entirely separate books are kept on those funds. The "501(c) (3) fund" receives contributions which are deductible for the contributor. The "501(c) (4) fund" receives contributions that are not deductible to the contributor. The membership dues to the plaintiff NYCLU are placed in the 501 (c) (4) fund. However, an individual may choose to have his contributions or funds placed in the 501 (c) (3) fund. Plaintiff NYCLU annually files tax returns on the 501 (c) (3) and the 501 (c) (4) accounts, and the NYCLU files all information required by the Internal Revenue Service, including "990 forms."

[045]

LAURA WERTHEIMER

1. In 1972, Laura Wertheimer managed the congressional campaign of Avi Nelson in the Republican primary in the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts. She is also active in the Libertarian Party and has engaged in campaign-funding solicitation for that Party in New York. Affidavit ¶1; Tr. 32-33; 38-39.

2. In the 1972 Republican primary in the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, there were four candidates. Two were incumbent State elected officials; one was a former Congressman. Avi Nelson, the fourth, was a graduate student, had no connections with Republican organizations in the state, and had never held public office, and was living on student loans and savings. Affidavit ¶¶2, 3.

3. A poll taken in the spring of 1972 revealed that Nelson's name recognition factor among district voters was less than one percent. Affidavit ¶3.

4. In the early stages, Mr. Nelson's campaign was financed by a small number of contributions and loans, gathered through a series of personal fund-raising visits to individuals. Once this money was collected, it was possible for the campaign to make a mailing to district Republican activists (costing $5,000) and to place a large advertisement in a Boston newspaper. The campaign eventually raised a total of approximately $70,000 of which $22,000 is in still-outstanding loans. Affidavit ¶¶4-7; Tr. 46-47, 54, 59.

[046]

5. In the four-way primary Mr. Nelson received 30.1 percent of the votes (6,115), finishing in second place behind the winner, who received 33.5 percent (16,811) of the votes. Affidavit ¶7.

6. Two persons solicited by Wertheimer in a Libertarian Party campaign refused to contribute because they were unwilling for their names to be disclosed or published. Tr. 32.

7. An individual who is unable to devote his time to a political campaign has options (absent statutory prohibition) to contribute either to the candidate or to the party. Affidavit ¶21.

8. Regarding the three persons who ran against Mr. Avi Nelson in the 1972 Republican primary for House of Representatives in the Massachusetts 4th district, Wertheimer testified that she did not know whether the two opponents, at that time members of the Massachusetts legislature, utilized staff members, free mailing privileges, or other privileges provided by the State of Massachusetts in the primary campaign. Tr. 8-11. The third opponent to Mr. Nelson was not an incumbent officeholder at the time of the 1972 Republican primary. Tr. 11.

9. Wertheimer testified that she did not know how much money was raised by Mr. Nelson or his opponents in contributions over $1,000 or the aggregate of those portions in contributions exceeding $1,000. Tr. 21-22.

[047]

10. At the time of the 1972 Republican primary in Massachusetts, Massachusetts law limited contributions to candidates to $3,000, but that limit did not apply to loans. Tr. 23-24.

11. Wertheimer is not aware of any incident of harassment or reprisal against persons whose names were reported as contributors to the Libertarian Party pursuant to New York law in the 1972 New York campaign discussed in her affidavit. Tr. 41.

[048]

CLARKE REED

1. Clarke Reed is Chairman of the Mississippi Republican Party, a political party in the State of Mississippi. It is part of the National Republican Party. The Mississippi Republican Party has nominated in the past and intends to nominate in 1976 candidates for the offices of President of the United States, United States Senator from the State of Mississippi, and Members of the United

States House of Representatives from some of the Congressional Districts of the State of Mississippi. The State Central Committee of the Mississippi Republican Party voted in 1972 not to solicit, receive, or expend money on behalf of candidates for the above-mentioned offices because it opposed in principle the requirements imposed on political committees which engaged in such activities by the FECA. Affidavit ¶ 1; Tr. 3, 6.

2. In 1972, Senator Eastland, the Democrat, received four times the amount of contributions than did Mr. Carmichael, his Republican opponent. Senator Eastland reported under the FECA spending $416,900. Of this amount, $55,700 was the excess of contributions of $1,000 or more by individuals and the excess of $5,000 or more by organizations. His Republican opponent Mr. Carmichael reported spending under the FECA $153,307. 114 individuals were identified as contributors to Mr. Carmichael's campaign and contributed $58,647. $13,700 is the excess of contributions over $1,000 contributed by individuals or $5,000 contributions by organizations to Mr. Carmichael's campaign.

[049]

3. The State Central Committee of the Mississippi Republican Party has determined not to contribute over $1,000 to any future candidate for federal office exclusing it from the requirement to file as a political committee under the FECA. The State Central Committee determined not to contribute over $1,000 to any future candidate for federal office in order to protect the confidentiality of its contributors.

4. The State Central Committee of the Mississippi Republican Party is opposed to the disclosure of contributions in principle.

5. Reed has never written to a contributor to ask whether that contributor would mind having his or her name disclosed.

6. No individual who is making ongoing contributions to the Mississippi Republican Party ever told Reed they would withdraw his support if his name were disclosed.

7. The Mississippi Republican Party engaged in fund raising to finance the basic operations of the Party. Approximately 2/3 of the funds used to finance the base operations are derived from contributions in excess of $100 per year which comes from contributors of $10 per month made on a bank draft system. Affidavit ¶30; Tr. 55-56.

8. Becoming a reporting political committee would require the Mississippi Republican Party to disclose publicly all contributions in excess of $100, and all expenditures. The Party is fearful of such disclosure, because of those Party members who do not want their political contributions publicly known. Affidavit ¶29.

[050]

9. The Mississippi Republican Party's basic fundraising system is such that a great number of contributors give in excess of $100 per year. A large portion of the Party's funds come from contributions of $10 per month made on a bank draft system. The Party raises approximately two-thirds of the funds used to run the base operations of the Party through the bank draft system. Affidavit ¶30, Tr. 55-56.

10. Some Mississippi Republicans have contributed in excess of $1,000 to Republican candidates for federal office in Mississippi.

11. Prior to the enactment of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, the Mississippi Republican Party did contribute directly to federal candidates. Affidavit ¶36.

12. In 1966 the Mississippi Republican Party directly contributed to candidates for federal office as follows:

Alexander campaign	$ 7,565.45
McAllister campaign	7,864.51
Moyce campaign	7,672.66
Walker campaign	32,291.75
Wise campaign	7,555.51
Fund Raising Dinners	3,300.12
	$66,250.00

Reed Ex. 2.

13. The Mississippi Republican Party has only made one contribution in excess of $10,000 to a candidate for federal office and that was $15,000 to a candidate for Congress in 1970. Tr. 71-72.

14. Mr. Reed knows of no specific instances where anyone was harassed as a result of the reporting requirements of FECA. Tr. 84-85.

[051]

15. Reed does not know how many individuals contributed in excess of $1,000 to Mississippi Democratic candidates for federal office in 1972 and 1974; nor to Mississippi Republican candidates for federal office in 1974. Nor does he know how much in excess of $1,000 per individual was raised by Mississippi Republican and Democratic candidates for federal office in 1972 and 1974. He did not make an effort to determine how many individuals contributed in excess of $1,000. Tr. 77-78.

16. One candidate of the Mississippi Republican Party for federal office has beaten an incumbent Congressman or Senator. In 1964 Prentiss Walker defeated

Congressman Arthur Winstead in what was then known as the Fourth District of Mississippi. Available records do not reflect how much each candidate spent on his campaign. Affidavit ¶40.

[052]

JAMES C. ROBERTS

1. The Conservative Victory Fund (hereinafter CVF) is a registered political committee under the FECA and has disclosed the names of contributors of over $100 since the effective date of the FECA of 1971. Affidavit ¶3; Tr. 5-6. CVF and the American Conservative Union (hereinafter ACU) are affiliated. CVF and ACU have most of their officers in common, they share office space, they work on common matters in some cases, and both organizations share adherence to the same principles. Tr. 8-9.

2. CVF is an unincorporated association of the District of Columbia, established in 1970 for the purpose of raising funds to aid in the election of candidates for public office who are dedicated to the principles of conservatism. Affidavit ¶2. One of the purposes of the ACU is to lobby on behalf of or against specific legislation in Congress. Tr. 73.

3. James C. Roberts is Executive Director of the CVF, and executed the affidavit filed by CVF in this action. He first became affiliated with CVF in December 1974. From January 1974 to December 1974 he was an employee of the ACU. Affidavit ¶1; Tr. 5-7.

4. CVF pays no salaries. Roberts' salary is paid by ACU. Tr. 9.

5. CVF is not affiliated with the Conservative Party of New York. CVF and the Conservative Party of New York have one officer in common. Tr. 9, 10.

[053]

6. In 1974 the CVF received a contribution of $8,000 which was earmarked for a particular candidate. This contribution and the fact that it was earmarked for a particular candidate was disclosed on the report of receipts and expenditures filed by the CVF under the FECA. The contributor refused to give through his local party organization. Affidavit ¶5; Tr. 14.

7. In 1972 and 1974, the CVF contributed $220,080 to 118 candidates for federal office. Of this total, $48,650 was contributed to 35 incumbents, $60,250 was contributed to 29 challengers to incumbents, and $102,360 was contributed to 54 candidates running for unoccupied offices. Tr. 58-65, Exhibits 7 and 8.

Of the total $220,080 contributed to candidates for federal office in 1972 and 1974 by the CVF, $14,450 was the excess of nine contributions which exceeded $5,000. Tr. 58-65, Exhibits 7 and 8.

The $14,450 in contributions in excess of $5,000 is comprised of $6,000 excess contributed to one candidate, $6,400 excess contributed to six candidates running for unoccupied seats, and $2,050 excess contributed to two challengers to incumbents. Tr. 58-65, Exhibits 7 and 8.

In 1970 the CVF contributed $149,250 to 61 candidates for federal office. Of this total, 39,250 was contributed to 12 incumbents, $76,000 was contributed to 28 challengers to incumbents, and $34,000 was contributed to 21 candidates running for unoccupied offices.

[054]

Of the total $149,250 contributed to candidates for federal office in 1970 by the CVF, $18,750 was the excess of seven contributors which exceeded $5,000.

The $18,750 in contributions in excess of $5,000 is comprised of $6,000 excess contributed to one candidate, $3,750 excess contributed to six candidates running for unoccupied seats, and $16,500 excess contributed to five challengers to incumbents.

8. In the three election years in which CVF has been active so far – 1970, 1972, and 1974 – it has contributed a total of approximately $370,000 to the campaigns of 179 candidates for the U.S. House and Senate. Affidavit ¶3; Tr. 51.

9. CVF solicits funds through the mail. Tr. 72.

10. Persons solicited by CVF for contributions are members of ACU, contributors to ACU, and persons on fund-raising lists which are available. Tr. 76.

11. In 1974, a typical fund-raising year for CVF, it received over 9,500 individual contributions. The approximate average contribution was $16. Affidavit ¶5.

12. CVF is not in any direct or indirect way connected to any political party. Affidavit ¶9.

13. In 1972 the CVF received three contributions over $1,000. One was for $1,500, one for $2,000 and the third was for $3,000. In 1974 the CVF received one contribution over $1,000 and that was for $8,000 and earmarked for a specific candidate. Affidavit ¶5; Tr. 14, Exhibit 1.

[055]

14. The CVF has not made a campaign contribution to a Presidential candidate. Tr. 42.

15. The CVF does not now plan to form a new political party. Tr. 42-43.

16. In 1970 CVF contributed $8,000 to the unsuccessful conservative Republican candidacy of Anderson Carter for U.S. Senator from New Mexico. In 1972 CVF contributed $2,000 to the successful conservative Republican candidacy of Pete Domenici for U.S. Senator from New Mexico. CVF believes that the 1970 Carter campaign paved the way to some extent for the 1972 Domenici victory. Affidavit ¶17.

[056]

THOMAS S. WINTER

1. Thomas S. Winter is the Editor of HUMAN EVENTS, a weekly newspaper published by HUMAN EVENTS, INC., a Delaware Corporation. He has been with HUMAN EVENTS since 1961 and has been the Editor since 1966. HUMAN EVENTS, INC., is now owned solely by Winter and Allan H. Ryskind, HUMAN EVENTS Capitol Hill Editor. The newspaper is not controlled directly or indirectly by any political party or political committee. Affidavit ¶1.

2. Established in 1944, HUMAN EVENTS now has approximately 70,000 subscribers throughout the country. It weekly publishes a newspaper dealing primarily with events of political importance and interest, with the discussion of public issues and with discussion of public officials, political leaders and candidates. Many of these articles are made available in reprint form and thereby receive even wider distribution. HUMAN EVENTS also distributes books, tapes, pamphlets and other forms of communication to further its corporate and editorial purposes. Affidavit ¶2.

3. For approximately five months in every election year since 1962, HUMAN EVENTS runs a feature called "Races of the Week" in which it spotlights selected electoral contests that it feels would be of interest to its

readers. To date, it has run over 400 of these stories and intends to run this feature in 1976 and in every successive congressional election year. Affidavit ¶3.

[057]

4. HUMAN EVENTS also published articles on selected special elections as they have arisen and it has run many articles on the various presidential candidates in the last 31 years. See attachments to affidavit of Thomas W. Winter. Affidavit ¶4.

5. HUMAN EVENTS endorses explicitly or by implication certain candidates for federal offices or, where it deems it necessary and appropriate, it refrains from endorsing any candidate for a particular federal office. Affidavit ¶5.

5. HUMAN EVENTS readers are active politically. Its most recent readership survey showed that in the 12 months prior to the survey, 14 percent of its subscribers held office in a political group or organization; 30 percent had been volunteer workers in a political campaign, 32 percent had attended regular meetings of political groups or organization; 70 percent had written letters to educators, editors or elected representatives; and 73 percent had made at least one financial contribution to a political party, a candidate or a political organization. Affidavit ¶7.

7. HUMAN EVENTS perceives its harm as arising from the fact that the statutory definition of "expenditure" in 2 U.S.C. § 431(f) and 18 U.S.C. § 591(f) explicitly exempts any "news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station, newspaper, magazine, or other periodical publications, unless such facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee,

[058]

or candidate" in contrast to the statutory definition of "contribution" in 2 U.S.C. § 431(e) and 18 U.S.C. § 591(3) which does not. Tr. 4.

8. HUMAN EVENTS has explicitly or implicitly endorsed candidates for federal office in the past and intends to do so in the future. Affidavit ¶10.

9. Every day, HUMAN EVENTS receives dozens of newsletters, speeches, and other material from members of Congress, distributed free of charge by the postal service. It uses some of this material. Affidavit ¶11A.

[059]

DANIEL JOY

1. Daniel Joy is the Treasurer of the American Conservative Union (ACU). He has had ten years of experience in organizations similar to ACU and four years of experience in ACU. Tr. 16; Affidavit ¶1; Tr. 3. Daniel Joy has participated in the campaigns of, and has personal knowledge of the fundraising activities of: Barry Goldwater's 1964 Presidential campaign; Claude Kirk's 1966 Gubernatorial campaign in Florida; Edward Gurney's 1968 Senatorial campaign in Florida; and William Scott's 1972 Senatorial campaign in Virginia. He also has personal knowledge of Robert Bauman's 1973 Congressional campaign in Maryland. Tr. 33-34.

2. ACU, a non-profit, voluntary, unincorporated association of the District of Columbia, was established in 1964 for the purpose of maintaining an organization for American people who adhere to the statement of principles outlined in ACU's constitution. Affidavit ¶2.

3. ACU has made contributions to candidates for federal office in the past. The ACU terminated its registration as a political committee under the FECA on

October 13, 1974, at which time it informed the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate that it had no intention to make political contributions to candidates for federal office. Joy Tr. at 9. It has not changed that policy. However, Daniel Joy testified that the ACU may in the future again become a political committee within the meaning of the reporting and disclosure requirements of the FECA as amended. Affidavit ¶2; Tr. 5-6.

[060]

4. ACU has a continuing and active interest in federal regulation of the political process. ACU has from time to time engaged in lobbying activities. Tr. 20-21.

5. ACU publishes, both in communications to its members and to the general public, annual ratings of all members of Congress which are distributed to its members and to the media. These ratings list the voting records of incumbent members of both Houses of Congress, showing whether these incumbents supported or opposed positions of interest to ACU and its members. Similarly distributed are ACU's positions on various public issues and political candidates. Affidavit ¶5.

6. ACU encourages its members, adherents and supporters to engage in whatever activities mentioned above they are willing and able to undertake. Affidavit ¶10.

7. As the ACU's past filings with the Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate will show, many contributors refuse to give the required information about occupation and place of business. Tr. 20.

8. The ACU reported the names and addresses of 137 individuals who contributed $100 or more to the ACU between April 7, 1972 and February 28, 1975, pursuant to the FECA. Joy Exhibits 2, 3 and 6. Mr. Joy did not know whether any contributor had been

harassed because of the disclosure of his contribution to CVF. Tr. 17. Mr. Joy has not been told that contributions to the ACU have declined since the effective date of the FECA. Tr. 19-20. No person has specifically told Mr. Joy that he will not contribute to the CVF because his name would be disclosed. Tr. 28.

[061]

9. Mr. Joy testified that persons have been harassed because they were in receipt of funds from ACU. Tr. 17-18.

10. In attempting to raise funds for Young Americans for Freedom in southern New England in 1965, Daniel Joy was told by a businessman who refused to contribute that while he would like to give money, the business community was hostile towards conservative political action. Another contributed but only after receiving a pledge from Joy that his name would not be divulged. That contribution was made in cash and on behalf of the YAF's collegiate chapter. Tr. 16-17, 23, 28.

11. The ACU has in the past made in-kind contributions to the CVF. Tr. 27. The ACU has also provided money for the CVF's direct-mail fundraising efforts. Tr. 11. For a variety of reasons a direct mail appeal may be a complete failure, and if a direct mail effort for an organization like ACU or CVF is a complete failure, it would be extremely difficult for those organizations to recoup. Tr. 31.

12. In the period 1972-1975, the ACU made one contribution of $2,500 to Mr. Robert Bauman, a candidate for federal office. Tr. 4, 7, 11. The Bauman for Congress Committee did not receive any contributions in excess of $5,000 from any political organization. Tr. 36.

13. Between April 7, 1972 and February 28, 1975, the ACU did not receive any contributions, in the aggregate, in excess of $1,000. Joy Exhibits 2, 3 and 6.

[062]

14. Larger contributions, those in the $1,000 range, are received very often towards the end of a candidate's political campaign. Tr. at 37, 39, 40.

[063]

EDWARD H. CRANE, III

1. Edward H. Crane, III, is the National Chairman of the Libertarian Party. Affidavit ¶ 1.

2. Formed in December 1971, the Libertarian Party held its first national nominating convention in June, 1972. It expended $1,423.91 for the convention. By that time, it had grown to a membership of nearly 1000. The delegates nominated Dr. John Hospers, a professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California, for President, and Ms. Thonie Nathan, a broadcast journalist and television producer for Vice President. Although the Libertarian Party was on the ballot in only two states in 1972, its national ticket travelled extensively throughout the country espousing the Libertarian Party philosophy. The Party ticket received one vote in the Electoral College in 1972. Its popular vote was approximately 10,000. By election day, 1972, membership had grown to 2000. Affidavit ¶ 5; Tr. 53-54, 59.

3. By 1974, Libertarian Party membership had grown to 5,000 individuals, and major campaign efforts were mounted in several federal elections. In Ohio, Ms. Kathleen Harroff received 79,400 votes (3 percent of the total) in her race for the United States Senate, finishing third behind Democrat John Glenn and Republican Ralph Perk. In Louisiana's Seventh Congressional

District, Mr. Jerry Millet, running against an incumbent, received 7,152 votes, 11 percent of the total votes case. In a number of these

[064]

races, candidates spent their own funds. Affidavit ¶ 7; Tr. 6-8, 14-15, although Crane does not know how much any Libertarian Party candidate has spent out of personal or immediate family funds on any campaign. Tr. 6-8.

4. In a New York Congressional race against incumbent Republican Hamilton Fish and Democrat Nick Angell, Mr. Sandy Cohen received 1.2 percent of the vote. Affidavit ¶ 8.

5. The Libertarian Party is now organized in forty states, and is a not-for-profit corporation under the Laws of the State of Colorado. Affidavit ¶ 9.

6. Crane does not know how many contributions to any of the Libertarian Party's federal candidates have been in excess of $1,000, nor does Mr. Crane know how much the candidates supported by the Libertarian Party for federal office spent on their campaigns or how much of what was spent was raised in contributions in excess of $1,000. Crane Exs. 6-19.

7. The Libertarian Party is a registered political committee under the FECA and has filed reports of receipts and expenditures since the date of its registration on June 26, 1972. The reports of receipts and expenditures filed by the Libertarian Party with the Supervisory Officers do not contain or show any contributions in excess of $1,000. Crane Exs. 1-10.

8. Crane estimates that of all contributions the Libertarian Party has received, approximately 10 out of 4,000 have been individual contributions in excess of $1,000. Tr. 55-57.

[065]

9. Approximately five individuals have indicated that they would exceed the $1,000 limit in monetary contributions. None of these individuals has given in excess of $1,000 in the past. Tr. 18-19.

10. The 1972 campaign of the Libertarian Party candidate for President spent between $5,000 and $6,000. Crane does not know how much any other Libertarian Party candidate spent on his or her campaign. Tr. 13-14.

11. The Libertarian Party has held one nominating convention in 1972, on which it spent $1,423.91. Tr. 53-54; Ex. 2, at 2.

12. Crane knows of no contributor to the Libertarian Party or to its candidate who incurred harm because of the disclosure of his name as a contributor. Tr. 38.

13. The names of contributors who have given over $100 have been disclosed in the past. None of these have indicated that they would not give again if the activity of disclosure continues. Tr. 57-58, 62.

[066]

HARRY M. FOX

1. Harry M. Fox was the Republican nominee for the House of Representatives from the Twelfth Congressional District of Pennsylvania in two elections in 1974. The first was a special general election on February 5, 1974, to fill the seat left vacant by the death of the long-time (thirteen term) Republican incumbent John Saylor. Mr. Fox had been Mr. Saylor's Administrative Assistant for 25 years. Fox's Democratic opponent was John P. Murtha who won. The vote totals in February were as follows:

Murtha (D)	60,538	(49.9%)
Fox (R)	60,416	(49.8%)
McCormick (Constitution Party)	472	
Total	121,426	
Murtha Plurality	122	

The second was the regular general election, held in November, 1974. In that election, Mr. Fox was also defeated. The vote totals in November were as follows:

Murtha (D)	89,193	(58.1%)
Fox (R)	64,416	(41.9%)
Other	10	
Total	153,619	
Murtha Plurality	24,777	

Registered Democrats outnumber Republicans by approximately 8,000 out of a total of approximately 200,000 voters in the Twelfth District. Affidavit ¶1; Tr. 7.

[067]

2. In the February 1974 special election Harry M. Fox spent approximately $75,000 and his successful opponent spent approximately $90,000. Tr. 4.

3. In the February 1974 special election Mr. Fox received approximately $10,000 in contributions equal to or over $1,000. Two individuals contributed $3,000 each, and there were $2,000 and $1,000 contributions. Tr. 22.

4. In the November 1974 regular election, Mr. Fox received approximately five contributions in excess of $1,000. Tr. 22.

5. In the November general election, Mr. Fox's campaign spent approximately $42,000, and Mr. Murtha's spent approximately $55,000. Affidavit ¶17.

JAMES L. BUCKLEY, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v. **Civil Action No. 75-0001**

HON. FRANCIS R. VALEO, et al.,
Defendants.

PART IV. CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS

May 19, 1975

* * *

[001]

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS

1. Does the first sentence of §315(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act, *as amended*, 2 U.S.C. §437h(a), in the context of this action, require courts of the United States to render advisory opinions in violation of the "case or controversy" requirement of Article III, §2, of the Constitution of the United States?

2. Has each of the plaintiffs alleged sufficient injury to his constitutional rights enumerated in the following questions to create a constitutional "case or controversy" within the judicial power under Article III?

3. Does any statutory limitation, or do the particular limitations in the challenged statutes, on the amounts that individuals or organizations may contribute or expend in connection with elections for federal office violate the rights of one or more of the plaintiffs under the First, Fifth, or Ninth Amendment or the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States?

(a) Does 18 U.S.C. §608(a) violate such rights, in that it forbids a candidate or the members of his immediate family from expending personal funds in excess of the amounts specified in 18 U.S.C. §608(a)(1)? (First Amended Complaint (FAC) ¶¶ 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 86, 87, 88.)

[002]

(b) Does 18 U.S.C. §608(b) violate such rights, in that it forbids the solicitation, receipt or making of contributions on behalf of political candidates in excess of the amounts specified in 18 U.S.C. §608(b)? (FAC ¶¶ 55, 59, 60, 61, 62, 86, 87, 88.)

(c) Do 18 U.S.C. §§591(e) and 608(b) violate such rights, in that they limit the incidental expenses which volunteers working on behalf of political candidates may incur to the amounts specified in 18 U.S.C. §§591(e) and 608(b)? (FAC ¶¶ 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 86, 87, 88.)

(d) Does 18 U.S.C. §608(e) violate such rights, in that it limits to $1,000 the independent (not on behalf of a candidate) expenditures of any person relative to an identified candidate? (FAC ¶¶ 59, 60, 61, 62, 76, 86, 87, 88.)

(e) Does 18 U.S.C. §608(f) violate such rights, in that it limits the expenditures of national or state committees of political parties in connection with general election campaigns for federal office? (FAC ¶¶ 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 86, 87, 88.)

(f) Does §9008 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 violate such rights, in that it limits the expenditures of the national committee of a party with respect to presidential nominating

[003]

conventions? (FAC ¶¶ 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 86.)

(g) Do 2 U.S.C. §431(e) and (f) and 18 U.S.C. §591(e) and (f) violate such rights, in that they exempt news stories, commentaries, and editorials from the statutory definitions of "expenditure" but not from the statutory definitions of "contribution?" (FAC ¶¶ 84, 86, 87, 88.)

(g) Does 18 U.S.C. §608(b)(2) violate such rights, in that it excludes from the definition of "political committee" committees registered for less than the period of time prescribed in the statute? (FAC ¶¶ 59, 60, 61, 62, 77, 86, 87, 88.)

(i) Do 18 U.S.C. §608 and §9012 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 violate such rights, in that they provide that the government may bring criminal prosecutions against anyone who violates or is about to violate the provisions recited in those sections? (FAC ¶¶ 78, 86, 87, 88.)

4. Does any statutory limitation, or do the particular limitations in the challenged statutes, on the amounts that candidates for elected federal office may expend in their campaigns violate the rights of one or more of the plaintiffs under the First or Ninth Amendment or the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment?

[004]

(a) Does 18 U.S.C. §608(c) violate such rights, in that it forbids expenditures by candidates for federal office in excess of the amounts specified in 18 U.S.C. §608(c)? (FAC ¶¶ 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 86, 87, 88.)

(b) Do 18 U.S.C. §608 and §9012 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 violate such rights, in that they provide that the government may bring criminal prosecutions against anyone who violates or is about to violate the provisions recited in those sections? (FAC ¶¶ 78, 86, 87, 88.)

5. Does any statutory provision for the public financing of political conventions or campaigns for nomination or election to the Presidency or Vice Presidency violate the rights of one or more of the plaintiffs under the First or Ninth Amendment, the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, or Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, of the Constitution of the United States? (FAC ¶¶ 79, 80, 81, 82, 86, 87, 88.)

6. Do the particular provisions of Subtitle H and §6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 deprive one or more of the plaintiffs of such rights under the First or Ninth Amendment or Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, in that they provide federal tax money to support certain political candidates, parties, movements, and organizations or in the manner that they so provide such federal tax money? (FAC ¶¶ 79, 80, 81, 82, 86, 87, 88.)

[005]

7. Do the particular requirements in the challenged statutes that persons disclose the amounts that they contribute or expend in connection with elections for federal office or that candidates for such office disclose the amounts that they expend in their campaigns violate the rights of one or more of the plaintiffs under the First, Fourth, or Ninth Amendment or the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment?

(a) Do 2 U.S.C. §§432(b), (c), and (d) and 438(a)(8) violate such rights, in that they provide, through auditing procedures, for the Federal Election Commission to inspect lists and records required to be kept by political committees of individuals who contribute more than $10? (FAC ¶¶ 70, 86, 87, 88.)

(b) Does 2 U.S.C. §434(b)(1)-(8) violate such rights, in that it requires political committees to register and disclose the names, occupations, and principal places of buisiness (if any) of those of their contributors who contribute in excess of $100? (FAC ¶¶ 71, 86, 87, 88.)

(c) Does 2 U.S.C. §434(d) violate such rights, in that it neither requires disclosure of nor treats as contribution to or expenditure by incumbent officeholders the resources enumerated in 2 U.S.C. §434(d)? (FAC ¶¶ 72, 86, 87, 88.)

(d) Does 2 U.S.C. §434(e) violate such rights, in that it provides that every person contributing or expending more than $100 other than by contribution to a political committee or candidate (including volunteers with incidental expenses in

[006]

excess of $600) must make disclosure to the Federal Election Commission? (FAC ¶¶ 73, 86, 87, 88.)

(e) Does 2 U.S.C. §437a violate such rights, in that it requires any person who expends funds or commits any act for the purpose of influencing the outcome of an election or who publishes or broadcasts to the public any material advocating the election or defeat of a candidate, setting forth a candidate's position on any

public issue, his voting record, or any official acts to file reports with the Commission as if such person were a political committee? (FAC ¶¶ 74, 86, 87, 88.)

(f) Does 2 U.S.C. §441 violate such rights, in that it provides criminal penalties for violations of Chapter 14 of Title 2, U.S.C.? (FAC ¶¶ 75, 86, 87, 88.)

8. Do the provisions in the challenged statutes concerning the powers and method of appointment of the Federal Election Commission violate the rights of one or more of the plaintiffs under the constitutional separation of powers, the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, or Ninth Amendment, Article I, Section 2, Clause 6, Article I, Section 5, Clause 1, or Article III?

(a) Does 2 U.S.C. §437(a) violate such rights by the method of appointment of the Federal Election Commission? (FAC ¶¶ 66, 86, 87, 88.)

[007]

(b) Do 2 U.S.C. §§437d and 437g violate such rights, in that they entrust administration and enforcement of the FECA to the Federal Election Commission? (FAC ¶¶ 67, 86, 87, 88.)

(c) Does 2 U.S.C. §467g(a) violate such rights, in that it empowers the Federal Election Commission and the Attorney General to bring civil actions (including proceedings for injunctions) against any person who has engaged or who may engage in acts or practices which violate the Federal Election Campaign Act, *as amended*, or §608, 610, 611, 613, 614, 615, 616, or 617 of Title 18? (FAC ¶¶ 83, 86, 87, 88.)

(d) Does 2 U.S.C. §438(c) violate such rights, in that it empowers the Federal Election Commission to make

rules under the FECA in the manner specified therein? (FAC ¶¶ 68, 86, 87, 88.)

(e) Does 2 U.S.C. §456 violate such rights, in that it imposes a temporary disqualification on any candidate for election to federal office who is found by the Federal Election Commission to have failed to file a report required by Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act, *as amended*? (FAC ¶¶ 69, 86, 87, 88.)

(f) Does §9008 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 violate such rights, in that it empowers the Federal Election Commission to authorize expenditures of the national committee of a party

[008]

with respect to presidential nominating conventions in excess of the limits enumerated therein? (FAC ¶¶ 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 86.)

9. Do 2 U.S.C. §§431(b), (d), (e), and (f); 434(e); 437(a), 437(d), 437(g)(5-7), and 456; 18 U.S.C. §§591(b), (d), (e) and (f); 608(b) (6), (c) (4), (e); Internal Revenue Code of 1954 §§9002(2), (9); 9006(d); 9008(d)(3); 9032(2), (4), (8), and (9), and 9037 violate the constitutional rights of one or more of the plaintiffs in that they are excessively vague? (FAC ¶¶ 85, 87, 88.)

---

common cause
2030 M STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036
John W. Gardner, Chairman (202) 833-1200

July 16, 1975

The Honorable Howard Corcoran
United States District Court
for the District of Columbia
John Marshall Place & Constitution Avenue
Washington, D. C.

Dear Judge Corcoran:

It has been brought to my attention that a few typographical errors were made in the Conway findings, Section II.A. at pages 1, *et seq.*, when they were submitted to the Court. They do not materially affect any party's arguments. We would appreciate, however, having the record corrected to avoid any misinterpretations of the facts being made. The corrections to be made are:

p. 88, ¶ 12: "$1,184,204" *should read:* "$1,284,204."

p. 95, ¶ 32: "$351,557" *should read:* "$352,557."

p. 100, ¶ 49: "24 major party challengers" *should read:* "25 major party challengers."

p. 110, ¶ 72: "September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1975" *should read:* "January 1, 1971 through December 31, 1972."

p. 110, ¶ 73: "September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974" *should read:* "January 1, 1971 through December 31, 1972."

p. 111, ¶ 74: "September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974" *should read:* "January 1, 1971 through December 31, 1972."

p. 112, ¶ 75: "September 1, 1973 through December 31, 1974" *should read:* "January 1, 1971 through December 31, 1972."

p. 112, ¶ 76: "September 1, 1973 through December 1, 1974" *should read:* "April 7, 1972 through December 31, 1972."

p. 120, ¶ 96: "October 14, 1973" *should read:* "October 14, 1974."

p. 121, ¶ 99: "October 14, 1972" *should read:* "October 14, 1974."

p. 125, ¶ 107: "September 1, 1974" *should read:* "September 1, 1973."

I apologize for the inconvenience that these changes may impose upon the Court.

Sincerely,

/s/ Kenneth J. Guido, Jr.
Kenneth J. Guido, Jr.
Counsel for Intervening
Defendants, Common Cause
and John Gardner